

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY. 1905.

I.

CHAMBERLAIN, OUR NEW PROPHET.*

PROF. RICHARD C. SCHIEDT, PH.D.

The race problem is the guiding principle of Chamberlain's work, it is fundamental in his "foundations." However, it is not new with him, he follows the method of the modern historical school. Belles-lettres and art, politics and science are to-day controlled by the race shibboleth. Fifty years ago Buckle introduced the geographical factor into the study of history and Ratzel followed in pointing out the preëminence of mountains, rivers and forests for such study, but was superseded again by Marx and Engals who emphasized the economic values and with them the struggle between the classes and the masses. Then the Austrian Gumplowicz came and placed with his term "race struggle" the race problem into the foreground of historical inquiry. But Count Gobineau had discussed the inequality of the human races fully fifty years before, and Paul de Leussé applied his discoveries to a new historical method. Le Bon introduced the race problem into sociology; Lapouge into ethnography; Ammon into anthropology and finally Chamberlain into the history of civilization and culture. The present struggle in the Far East has added new political significance to the discussion, while the negro

* See the April number of this REVIEW.

question in our own country constantly reminds us of its vital importance. From the standpoint of pure science it is to be regretted that the race problem occupies such a prominent place in partisan politics. Irrational prejudices cannot decide the contest between the claims for universal oneness of the race on the one hand and irreconcilable race differences on the other. Chamberlain professes to deal with the problem from the standpoint of pure science, and pure science is expected to be free from any bias, *i. e.*, purely objective. But if we ask the acknowledged authorities on the subject whether there is such a thing as a race problem in science, their answer is an emphatic "no." John Stuart Mill declares the attempt to explain the conduct and character of men from the standpoint of their respective races to be the most vulgar of all methods, and Thomas Buckle readily endorses this sentiment. Charles Darwin uses the term "preservation of favored races in the struggle for life," but recognizes the impossibility of defining, from a one-sided standpoint, the meaning of race, variety, type, etc. He declares all racial characteristics to be variable and therefore transitory and arbitrary. Other authorities are still more severe in their condemnation of a hard and fast rule. Nietzsche warns us not to associate with anyone who has any part in the race discussions. Not much more favorable are Virchow and Friedrich Ratzel. The latter calls the term Indogermanic or Arian race a scientific contradiction which should be abolished, for the so-called Indogermans present an endless chaos of differences and opposites in the color of their hair and the shape of their heads and can only claim similarity in language. Non-specialists on the other hand like Chamberlain and Disraeli, insist that race is everything and that repeated crossing of widely different races leads to annihilation. They are very emphatic in their declaration that racial differences determine character. Such concepts as Arian, Indogermanic, Slavoceltogermanic, Semitic, Mongolian, etc., imply fundamental opposites, separated by wide chasms which cannot be bridged over. Chamberlain exclaims:

"Is it possible that at the end of the nineteenth century there are still learned scholars who do not yet know that the form of the skull and the structure of the brain are of decisive influence upon the form and structure of thought, limiting the effect of environment, however great it may be, through these initial facts of physical endowment to definite capacities and possibilities. O, mediævalism, when will thy domination over us cease! When will men begin to understand that shape and form are not mere accidents but the expression of one's own inmost character?"

This is certainly a plain statement. Personality and race are interdependent, personal force is conditioned by blood. He goes on to show that scientific breeding of high grade plants and animals has verified and is constantly verifying his claims. The dray-horses of Limousin, the American trotters, the Irish winners of the turf and the absolutely reliable setters are the result of sexual selection and the maintenance of race purity. Both dogs and horses offer plenty of opportunity to reiterate the truth, that physical, intellectual and moral endowments are closely interwoven. A bastard dog is generally very alert to learn, but never reliable and morally always a rascal. Continued crossing of two strong animal races leads inevitably to the extinction of the prominent characteristics in both; and human races are just as different in character and endowment as bulldog, grayhound, and poodle. The ambitious rivalry among the various Greek critics developed in each according to the law of natural selection the high-grade characteristic features so prominent in the Greek family type. But when the Macedonians and Romans came upon the scene with their leveling influences, especially when from the North and the East and the West constantly new tribes swept over the land, the "eternally" Greek dominion disappeared, art and philosophy were no more, and the "beautiful" Hellenic personality vanished forever. Rome teaches the same lesson. The old Romans were an original people, a pure race, the result of closely related types, viz. the Latin

and Sabellian, different from any previous or any later race in endowment and ability, a race of mighty talents; but the continued wars decimated the best Roman families and with them the city of Rome, so that in the time of Marius and Sulla the foreign blood from Asia and Africa rushed like a cataract into the almost depopulated eternal city and the once powerful nation soon ceased to be. On the other hand the modern Jew has retained his racial strength because of his strict obedience to his blood-law which interdicts marriage with gentiles; this law, however, dates only from post-captivity days, after the flower of ancient Israel had been practically destroyed through the frequent mixing with foreign blood. In modern times England, Prussia and Japan are evidences of new and powerful creations, the result of close inbreeding and sparing inoculation of related blood. Nature proves herself inexhaustibly rich, constantly producing new material, enlarging the wealth of ideas and substituting in place of decaying realms new worlds for the imagination.

From the few examples just cited we can easily see that Chamberlain's term "race" is not definitely circumscribed; we can only surmise that race with him is a subdivision of a larger category, such as Slavoceltogermanic and the still larger Arian. I would therefore not ascribe a strictly methodical value to his word but merely a differential value. He is likewise not always consistent in his arguments. Whenever his anthropological data fail he coolly substitutes moral data, or he starts out to prove certain ethical traits from an anthropological or zoological point of view, but as soon as he meets with unsurmountable difficulties he reverses his method and proves the same thing as zoological traits from a moral point of view. In the discussion of the term "Arian" Chamberlain admits the wide differentiations in physical structure, but insists upon it that the close relationship in thinking and feeling makes nevertheless all these people one. Still taking his discussion as a whole and assuming his position we must admire the masterly skill with which he marshals his innumerable

facts as well as the keen insight into the historical conditions of modern Europe, crowning his fascinating arguments for the race problem with the presentation of five natural laws which he finds coöperative in the making of great races. The first fundamental condition is unquestionably the existence of *excellent material*; whence it came we do not know, but we have observed that the severe struggle for existence strengthens strong factors or elements through the exclusion of the weaker; the childhood of great races is spent in the midst of fierce wars, even that of the metaphysical inhabitants of India. The second requisite for the development of a great race is *continued inbreeding*, reproduction within the narrow tribal confines without the admixture of foreign blood. *Natural selection* is a third factor, as exemplified by the artificial breeding of plants and animals. The fast race-horse and the exquisite chrysanthemum are the result of careful choice and of the exclusion of all that is of lesser value. We see this practice operative among Jews, Greeks, Romans and Germans in the exclusion of undesirable and weakly children. *Inoculation* of related blood is a fourth requisite for the development of extraordinary races. Emerson already says: "We are piqued with pure descent but nature loves inoculations." The history of Greece furnishes one of the most convincing proofs in this respect. The migration of the strong Dorians southward, and the East and West movements of the Ionians resulted naturally in crossings with the original Pelasgian population and led to the rise of magnificent Athens. Similar examples are furnished in the inoculation of Anglo-Saxon with Norman blood, of Saxon with Slav blood, of Allemannian with Celtic blood, etc. A fifth law operative in this process is the necessity of *limitation in crossings*.

The addition of new blood must take place early in the development of a race and should occur only rarely. An extreme example is furnished by the crossing of the famous English greyhounds with bulldogs, which, when occurring only once, gives greater courage and endurance to the original

stock, while repeated crossings resulted only in the production of worthless bastards. The human race obeys the same laws. The Englishman of to-day is the result of the mixing of the closely related Germanic tribes with the Normans through one single invasion. The best negative proof is furnished by the Mestizzo states of South America. The degeneracy of the Peruvians and Paraguayans is the outcome of the union of two or more entirely opposite races, viz., of Indians and Spaniards, of Indians and Negroes, of Spaniards and Negroes, and of the Mestizzos among themselves. A beastly barbarianism is the prevailing condition among these poor unfortunate South Americans and other Spanish colonists.

Chamberlain, however, does not deny that every race has a certain capacity for absorbing foreign blood without injury to itself, but claims that this capacity has its limitations. The term race then is with him a very narrow term; it is best defined in its relation to the term nation. *It is after all the nation in the political sense which creates the best conditions for race developments*, leading to the highest, most individualized race activities. Wherever the formation of nations has failed, as in India, race vitality gradually loses its vigor and strength. Rome, as an empire, was the embodiment of the antinational principle; its aim was universal rule, universal leveling, a universal language, and the result was the annihilation of race characteristics and with it the rise of an intellectual and moral chaos. Salvation from this chaos came only with the crystallization of nations. The *summum bonum* in this respect is, according to Chamberlain, the differentiation of the Germanic nations with their distinct racial characteristics. The same relation which exists between race and nation exists likewise between the race and its chief fruit, the genius. The great geniuses of a race are the distinct physiognomy of that race; but they are also part and parcel of the race. It is true that Greece would not have become immortal in history without Homer, but there would have likewise been no Homer without the Greeks, without Euclid, or Aristotle, or

Aristarchus, etc. It is the whole race which creates the language and the soil of a people. Philosophy could never grow in Hebrew soil, because the Hebrew language lacked the power of interpreting metaphysical thoughts. It is after all the racial atmosphere, so to speak, which permits a Shakespeare, or a Bach, or a Beethoven. The lack of environment favorable to racial growth and development led to that deplorable condition of Europe which Chamberlain calls the chaos of nations, and to which he attributes all the ills of modern times. Among all the various elements which inhabited Europe during the first centuries of the Christian era only two represented pure races, viz., the Jews and the Germanic tribes; all the rest were irrevocably lost bastards. Salvation came from the North, but even this not without the severest struggle against chaos and Judaism, so that we might say with Chamberlain: "The burden of modern history is the struggle between Semite and German"; the course of history is predestined by the blood of the races; nationality, confessions, laws and customs are only reflexes, as it were, of the blood.

In the struggle for the inheritance of Europe's strong racial creations, Chamberlain describes the Semite as the illegitimate aggressor, foreign to everything European, while the German is represented in strong and bold outlines as the lawful heir of Greek and Roman, Aryan as they, blood of their blood and mind of their mind. He only comes to his own. The African slave had already usurped the Roman throne, and the Lyrian bastard claimed the Roman law, while the Judaist endeavored to foist Greek philosophy upon the Mosaic code and the Egyptian attempted to force the revelations of nature's realm into dead systems; the Mongolian had made havoc with the sacred books of the East and the Beduin had wiped out the majestic symbolism of a thousand years; art had perished long ago, the rich worshipped at the shrine of a dead formalism, and the common people sought their ideals in the circus ring. It was high time that the saviour should

appear to rescue agonizing humanity from the claws of the eternally beastly.

The Germanic race by no means existed as a unit. But though divided into many tribes and distracted by internal hostilities, as it is to the present time, the foreigner nevertheless recognized them as of one blood. Tacitus calls them a special unmixed people which only resembles itself. And yet the type which he describes as the people with the radiant blue eyes, the reddish hair, and the high stature extended much further than he ever dreamed of. In the oldest tombs of the Eastern Slav there are found to-day the same dolichocephalous skulls and gigantic skeletons as were characteristic of the old Germanic tribes, while in the Keltic region of Northwestern Scotland the modern inhabitant still shows the same Teuton eyes and reddish hair, reminding us by his mental grasp of his old Keltic ancestors from Scotus Erigena down to Duns Scotus. No less potent are the proofs for Germanic relationships in Keltic Brittany, personified in Peter Abélard, the champion of religious freedom and preserved in the songs of Roland, of Charlemagne, of the Holy Grail, of King Arthur's Round Table, of Tristan and Isolde, and of Parsifal. Similar claims are made in behalf of the Slavish element, although the modern Slav has been almost entirely absorbed by other races. Still in the Herzegowina and in Bosnia the old blond type with the blue eyes predominates, reminding us of the first martyr blood shed here in behalf of religious freedom during the Reformation time. Here protestantism was born, the Germanic protestantism which found its ready defenders in the related nobility and intellectual aristocracy of old Poland.

However, Chamberlain also finds certain limitations which characterize the Germanic type. He acknowledges that almost daily new material is being discovered which seems to prove that entirely unrelated types (Virchow's famous Prekelts, Ammon's Turanians) have been largely represented from the very beginning in our modern so-called Arian nations, so that

after all "one should only speak of Arian individuals, never of an Arian people." As a matter of course, the latest anthropological investigations demonstrate the fact that the typically Germanic characteristic (skull, stature, hair and eyes) are steadily on the decrease, while the Turanian characters constantly increase. In the tombs discovered in Baden and belonging to the time of the migration of nations, 69.2 per cent. of dolichocephalous skulls over against 9.4 per cent. of brachycephalous skulls were found, while at present the proportion of the former to the latter is 10.4 per cent. to 40.3 per cent., showing just the reverse condition. This seems to prove that the modern leading Indogermanic nations must be the result of the crossing of distant and foreign elements. Ammon deduces from a series of data the conclusion that only in the higher strata of the population the Germanic element is prevalent, and that all our civilization and culture is practically the work of these few. Chamberlain offers a similar explanation. He seems to think that before the time when the pernicious belief in the equality of man had produced the social and ethnographic hotchpotch, a ruling race existed, separated and differentiated from an ethnographically inferior race, and the former with its wealth of physical, mental and spiritual strength forced its values and views of life upon the latter. This ethnographic overman is in Chamberlain's opinion the Germanic type, he is the aristocrat, endowed with a superabundance of capacity for beauty, bravery and culture, but also for morality and civilization.

Foremost among the gifts of this wonderful Germanic stock is its *genius for freedom*. Even the idea of freedom is unknown to most men. Semites and Semisemites were never able, in spite of their keen intellectual grasp, to construct a permanent state, they were only endowed with a natural proclivity for despotism and anarchy. Only a race which can organize a state government can be free, it is born with the instinct for freedom, just as some individuals are born artists or philosophers. This is a common Arian trait, but manifests

itself differently in Greek, Roman and German. Among the Greeks the individualistic creative power is prevalent, as demonstrated by a single Solon or a single Lycurgus; among the Romans it is the communistic power of the legislative body which grants freedom, or of the belligerent body which protects freedom, while among the Germanic tribes neither the one nor the other predominates, but both are harmoniously blended; the love of liberty of the individual finding its highest expression in the free creative power of art, is counterbalanced by the love of liberty on the part of the whole tribe which creates the state. The Greek productions may be more artistic, but they are certainly not more powerful than the immortal creations which include all that is human within the folios of a Shakespeare and the chiselings of an Albrecht Duerer, not to speak of that language which in harmonious accords enters the innermost chambers of the heart. And as regards statecraft, the Germanic states certainly show more enduring qualities in spite of their temporary and ever changing character than even the most enduring in the world's history. "In spite of the constant storm and stress of war, in spite of that old enemy, the national chaos, which carried its poison into the very heart of our nations, freedom and its correlative, the state, have, though sometimes greatly disturbed, remained throughout all times the formative and preservative ideal—this becomes more marked every day."

To make all this possible the common Arian trait of free creative power had to be supplemented by the specifically Germanic *virtue of faithfulness*, recognized as incomparable and peculiar on the very first day of their appearance. German loyalty is not that of the slave towards his master, but that of the free man towards himself. The Greeks, preëminent as the great poetic interpreters of political freedom, are proverbial for their unfaithfulness, the Romans could only be faithful in the defense of their own kin, but the Germans have excelled the greatest of all races in the virtue of faithfulness to a given pledge. Here is the central essence of Germanic

personality; it is the fruit of their Arian inheritance. Freedom is an explosive force which tears men apart, but Germanic faithfulness is the bond which by its inmost power unites men more firmly than the sword of the tyrant; it is reverence for ancestral virtues. To serve means to the free man to be his own supreme commander, faithfulness is to him self-determination, which alone guarantees freedom and independence. This Germanic trait is best understood when we compare Kant with Aristotle. The former makes the autonomy of the will the supreme principle of morality, and an individual only becomes a moral personality when it obeys its own laws, but these laws must be the outgrowth of an ideal. With him an ideal is a practical idea, with Aristotle it is only a theoretical idea, the former is creative, the latter only explicative. The Germanic man is therefore the most ideal and at the same time the most practical man in the world. He writes the critique of pure reason and at the same time invents the steam engine; the century of Bessemer and Edison is at the same time the century of Beethoven and of Richard Wagner. Newton interrupts his astronomical researches in order to write a commentary on Revelations and Bismarck listens in the most decisive moments of his strenuous life of blood and iron to the music of Beethoven's sonatas. Such is the character of the Germanic man from Chamberlain's viewpoint. "What *we have*," says he, "*is partly inheritance from the pre-Germanic antiquity, what we are is entirely the work of those primitive Germanic tribes which are often described as barbarians, but Montesquieu is right when he says, these people were not barbarians, for they were free; they only become such when, subject to an absolutistic power, they lost their freedom.*" That leads us to the conflict which for fifteen hundred years has raged between the Germanic and non-Germanic races.

When the Germanic races entered upon the arena of history they were confronted by the degenerated remnants of a once brilliant civilization; and the conflict which awaited them

had to be waged against foes they knew not of, viz., treason, hypocrisy and perjury. The temporary outcome at least could easily be foretold. Chamberlain gives us a series of superb sketches of the religious, the political, the philosophical and the industrial chaos which prevailed centuries after the fall of ancient Rome; he tells us how gradually the Germanic mind conquered the evils with which he was confronted, how he created the new and true ideas which control the modern world and how in it the perfection of human achievements will be realized. His chapter on Religion is an exhaustive treatise of the struggle between the various elements fighting for the control of the hearts of men. Jewish chronological belief and Indo-European symbolical and metaphysical mythology were the two fundamental pillars upon which the Christian theologians of the early church established the new religion. The slavish characters of the chaos needed a concrete religious law on the one hand in order to give them some sort of stability, and the formative influences of the versatile Greek genius on the other hand in order to unite them into a church whose confessions should meet world-wide needs. The one admitted the influences of Hellenic speculation, Egyptian asceticism and international mysticism, with its ideas of the Trinity, of redemption and grace, the other furnished definite historical events, a concrete messianic hope and with it the strong will to live. The Arian tendency to dogmatize entered upon a pernicious union with the historic shortsightedness and principal intolerance of the Jew. Here started the savage conflict for the possession of the power to formulate and enforce dogmas. Out of this enforced fusion of two entirely opposite world views grew subsequently all the ills of the Roman hierarchy, its paganism, its tyranny, its cursed greed for universal rule, transplanting its own hermaphroditic character into the bosom of the individual believer. For more than a thousand years poor humanity had to suffer this curse of chaos, until the Germanic rebellion against Rome succeeded in checking its devastating march, until nationalism overthrew

universalism, until individualism displaced priestly intervention and the free man worshipped his God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Yet, however great my admiration is for Chamberlain's profound grasp of historical situations and his incomparable skill to portray them, I am not blinded to the deficiencies of the logic of his ever recurring value-theories. He says very correctly and very beautifully: "The individual human being cannot be dealt with as the figure on a checker-board, but can only reach its highest destiny as a part of an organic whole." But this end would only be reached after passing through a demoralized period, a period in which the Germanic state-builders obtained their ideals and their culture from Hellas and Judea, learning the business of organization as members of the all-embracing universal church. It borders, therefore, almost on blindness to consider "the chaos resulting from the race mixture and anti-national universalism" as the exclusive source of all the misery. This conception is certainly wrong, because everyone must feel that nationalism can only remain a supreme end in view on the condition of a gradual evolution, otherwise it will end in national terrorism. At the time of the chaos we have on the one hand the growing national instinct of the new races, on the other the cosmopolitan wants and needs of the more highly differentiated European, wants which are the very outcome, even to this day, of Christianity, modern science and a capitalistic political economy.

Chamberlain overlooks the gigantic problem which is the source of the profoundest political questions of our age; he seems forever satisfied with the qualities of a "pure, noble race." *It* determines the oneness of descent as well as the sameness of the aim; *it* is the bond which unites the most unequal forces, the genius and the common herd, and leads them in the same "supra-individual" direction; *it* is the unsearchable "foundation" which explains the essential characteristics of the individual's actions, convictions and beliefs;

it is the eternal reminder of his national limitations which are to be his destiny, the source and guide of his tasks, the quintessence of his rights and privileges. What a deep abyss there is between this physiological philosophy of history and the anarchistic principle of the great Germanic philosopher, Fichte, expressed in the words "the ego is everything." Let the member of a noble race only follow his race instinct, it never deceives or belies him, claims Chamberlain, and somewhat in Goethe's fashion, maintains that "the tyche of his race never leaves him; it sustains him when his foot seems to stumble; it warns him like the Socratean daimonion when he is misled; it demands obedience and often forces him to deeds which he would have never dared to undertake because he did not comprehend their feasibility? Therefore not the universally human brings salvation but the historically and anthropologically conditioned, which reverses Fichte's dictum "only the metaphysical, never the historical, promises salvation. With Chamberlain there is principally at least no escape from the racial preformation and predestination of the soul. I say 'principally,' for he is forced to acknowledge in several important passages that this unbending mechanism of our physiological nature is not entirely bullet proof; he reluctantly admits that later on these highly praised Germanic heroes allowed themselves to be captivated and turned into knights of the anti-Germanic powers." Is such a daimonion infallible? But I shall not further insist upon the demands of that "logical punctuality" of concepts which Kant so painfully missed in Herder's Ideas. It suffices to know that it cannot be violated, no matter to what preconceived tendencies it is sacrificed. If we believe in Chamberlain's unfailing race-instinct we must declare Fichte's final world view as un-Arian and unsound, when he says: "May the earth-born sons, who recognize in the soil and the mountain their fatherland, remain citizens of the perishing state; they keep what they desire and what makes them happy; but the sun-born mind will irresistibly be attracted by and turn towards the

regions where light and right dwells." But let us not forget that in this doctrine of race-predestination, in this denial of all free self-determination (the autonomy of reason) there is hidden the purest naturalism, the coarsest materialism, that has ever been taught in connection with historico-philosophical discussions.

But Chamberlain has also his *universal values*, which considerably modify his race values and which I can heartily endorse as long as he does not go to extremes. "The birth of Christ," he says, "is the most important datum of the entire human history. No battle, the beginning of no individual reign, no natural phenomenon, no discovery possesses a significance which can be compared with the brief earthly career of the Galilean; a history of almost two thousand years proves it, although we have hardly entered upon the threshold of Christianity. It has its profound justification, to call that year the first and to date our time from it. Yes, in a certain sense we dare say, that real history only begins with the birth of Christ. The peoples, who do not yet belong to Christianity—the Chinese, the East Indians, the Turks, etc.—have as yet no true history, but only know on the one hand a chronicle of reigning houses, butcheries and the like, and on the other only the silent, devout, almost beastly happy vegetating life of untold millions, who vanish into the night of the ages without leaving a trace. Whether the realm of the Pharaohs began in the year 3285 B. C. or in the year 32850 is in itself entirely immaterial; to know Egypt under one Rameses means the same as to know it under all the fifteen Rameseses. The same is true of the other prechristian nations (with the exception of the three who stand in organic relation to our Christian epoch); their culture, their art, their religion, in short, their whole condition may interest us, nay, their intellectual accomplishments and their industry, may have become valuable component parts of our own life * * * but their history as such lacks the element of moral grandeur, that element through which the individual becomes conscious of his own indivi-

duality in contradistinction from his environment, in order to employ in turn the world which he has discovered in his inmost bosom for the transformation of that external world. The Arian Indian for instance, metaphysically the most highly endowed of all human beings and far superior in this respect to any of our modern races, stops short with his inner enlightenment; he does not transform or create, he is not artist, he is not reformer, it suffices him to live in gratitude and to die redeemed,—he has no history."

The appearance of the Christ is therefore of supreme value; it puts a stamp upon every phenomenon according to its degree of Christian influence. Those which stand in no positive relation to Christianity are according to Chamberlain without any culture value. His chapter on "*Weltanschauung und Religion*" is filled with such statements. True culture is only present wherever and whenever it is determined by inner experience, it is a change in the direction of the will, the longing for redemption from sin; a turning away from the sensual, a redemption through faith, a liberation through grace. This definition of culture, in contradistinction from civilization, excludes all ethnographical and anthropological factors, all the values of the sensuous and sensual world. Granting this definition to be true what becomes of the highly praised race-values?

We see then that Chamberlain's discussions gravitate towards two poles, towards the transcendental and moral in one direction and toward the material and sensuous in the opposite direction. A uniform world view is impossible. It must either rest on the earth or in heaven, either on the idea or on blood, on the race or on humanity. Chamberlain does not attempt to unify these contradictions by a synthesis. He cannot do so since he represents either as absolute. He says: Since the entrance of the Germanic races into the world's history they have received a foreign graft, a peculiar life principle, the Oriental Christian view of life. It has been the cause of all reformations and revolutions, its values are contrary to the Germanic organism; its new morality is felt as

a foreign body in the blood; the Nazarene estimate of life is in reality not in harmony with the actual development of Germanic culture and civilization. Nietzsche simply removes this foreign body by a surgical operation. Chamberlain is helpless since he acknowledges Christ to be all and in all; therefore his glaring inconsistencies, when he again and again reiterates that the canker which has been eating for fully fifteen hundred years into the very vitals of Germanic life has been introduced from the Orient like a pernicious plague.

But we of the Germanic race are carried away when our author speaks of the granite qualities of our own kin and blood, when he describes their warlike robust strength, their native virtues and customs, their proclivities to create and to expand, to rule over men and things, their love for adventures and discoveries, and of the very earthiness of their wishes and hopes, the quasi-physiological basis for their values and estimates. He is passionately eloquent and profoundly convincing. His chapters on Discovery, on Science and on Art are intensely rich. As discoverers, we are without rivals. "The prerequisite of the discoverer is childlike naiveté, therefore the wide open childlike eyes of a Faraday. The whole secret of the gift for discoveries lies in the willingness to allow nature to speak. This requires great self-control, which was wanting in the Greeks. The strength of their genius lay in their creative power, our strength in receptivity. For, nature does not obey the dictum of force, she does not speak how and what men want her to speak, but only through endless patience, through unconditional surrender can we learn out of a thousand groping attempts how she wants to be asked and what questions she cares to answer. Therefore is observation an exalted school for character training, testing endurance, conquering a selfish will and teaching absolute truthfulness. This is the rôle which nature study has played in the history of the Germanic races. She would play the same rôle in all our schools to-morrow, if the night of mediæval superstitions would once pass away and we would learn to understand that not the

childish repetition of obsolete knowledge contained in dead and little understood languages, nor the knowledge of so-called facts and still less science as such, but the *method* of acquiring knowledge, i. e., observation, should be the foundation of all education, the only discipline which develops both intellect and character, granting them freedom and preventing lawlessness, and which alone opens to each one the sources of all truth and all originality."

Any attempt to follow Chamberlain into all the highways and byways of Germanic activity in all spheres of human endeavor and to condense his elaborate arguments on a few pages of a REVIEW article would only be a ludicrous undertaking. I have tried to show the spirit and the method of the man and to touch here and there upon his merits as a modern prophet. If I have been at times apparently severe in my criticism, I have only tried in my own limited way to prove thereby the sincerity of my admiration for his great work. I still think that Chamberlain's "*Grundlagen Des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*" is the most remarkable book which has been published within the last forty years. I understand that an English translation has appeared in London; it should be read and reread by every lover of the truth and learning.

II.

THE INAUGURATION OF OUR NEW PROFESSORS.

REV. ELLIS N. KREMER, D.D.

The inauguration of Rev. John C. Bowman, D.D., and that of Rev. Christopher Noss, and Rev. William C. Schaeffer, D.D., as professors in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, was practically one event in the life of our Church, although separately conducted both as to time and place. These men had been chosen to fill vacancies in the faculty which had arisen, two of them by reason of death and one by resignation. It so happened that these vacancies were in chairs respectively controlled by the three synods by which the institution is maintained, and that it became the duty of each synod to elect one new professor.

This work completed, arrangements were made for the inauguration of the newly elected professors, the account of which has been published in pamphlet form and is placed before the writer for brief review. The unusual fact of three vacancies in the faculty occurring simultaneously, the coincidence noted above, namely, that each one of the three synods found it necessary to elect, the choice by one synod of the person whose resignation had been accepted by another synod, and the fact that two vacancies had been caused by death, made the whole period, from the time that initiatory measures were taken by the Board of Visitors for the elections, to the consummation of the work, a period of more than ordinary solemnity and interest to the Church. Therefore it is deemed well to precede the review of this pamphlet by an historical statement.

The year A. D. 1904 marks an epoch in the history of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United

States. The conditions which existed in the Seminary were such as to cause anxiety to its friends, and especially to the Board of Visitors, upon whom fell the responsibility of taking such measures as might successfully meet the exigencies of the case. The situation was one of extreme delicacy. The board had to take provisional action based on its knowledge of affairs; to acquaint the synods with the existing conditions; and to make such suggestions as the welfare of the institution demanded. While in some respects it had a beaten path to follow as already made by the law and custom of the Church, yet in others it felt the necessity of originating measures for which no provision had been made. It had to guard the rights of faithful and afflicted professors, and avoid the appearance of assuming authority vested in the synods whose servant the board is. All this was happily accomplished under the direction of a judicious president aided by members of experience, whose sympathy for the professors and devotion to the institution were expressed in such form as to command without question the hearty and favorable response of the synods.

The situation, as it then was, is familiar to the Church, and record of the same has been preserved in the minutes of synod. Since, however, this periodical will be consulted by those who do not have access to the minutes of synod, a brief statement is in place here, even though it will be a repetition of facts known to many of our readers.

The Board of Visitors met in special session in Lancaster, Pa., March 22, 1904, on the call issued by its president, Rev. E. R. Eschbach, D.D. The members present were: Reverends, S. G. Wagner, D.D., Ellis N. Kremer, D.D., B. B. Ferer, D.D., James Crawford, D.D., Eastern Synod; D. B. Lady, D.D., A. J. Heller, D.D., Pittsburgh Synod; E. R. Eschbach, D.D., J. Spangler Kieffer, D.D., J. W. Santee, D.D., Lewis Robb, Synod of the Potomac.

Rev. N. C. Schaeffer, D.D., Eastern Synod, had done much preliminary work which was of great aid to the board.

Before the board met it was learned that Rev. William

Rupp, D.D., was so ill that there was but little hope of his recovery, and, according to the judgment of his physician, he would be unable to resume the duties of his position, even if his life would be spared. Thus the chair of Practical Theology was vacant except as to name. Rev. Emanuel Gerhart, D.D., LL.D., whose remarkable vigor had enabled him to fill his chair, Systematic Theology, since 1868 without break, was at this time physically unable to bear the weight of duty and responsibility resting upon him. In view of his long and useful service the board felt that he should be relieved of his duties or be provided with an assistant. The doctor's own willingness and purpose to continue his work, and the remarkable vigor displayed by one of his years, and the universal love and respect which he commanded, made it necessary to approach the question of his honorable retirement in the most judicious way, and by private interview.

Rev. John C. Bowman, D.D., had received a call to the First Church, Easton, and had accepted the same subject to the action of his synod. Notice was given to the board of Dr. Bowman's intention to resign the chair of New Testament Exegesis.

Rev. Frederick A. Gast, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Theology had been in continuous service for almost thirty-three years, the duties of his position were onerous, and some of them could easily be discharged by a competent assistant. To preserve the strength of this faithful professor, to permit his time and eminent abilities to be best used in the service of the Church, we felt that an assistant should be provided, though the way for such provision did not open itself at that special meeting.

The death of Dr. Rupp followed soon after the meeting of the board and occurred on Easter morning, April 3, 1904. We lost in Dr. Rupp a professor who was eminent and honored as a thinker, teacher, and writer; one who hewed his own path by original thought and investigation; who commanded attention by the force of his ideas and the clearness of their ex-

pression, and respect by his fearless honesty; who was free from the art of pleasing and yet attracted to himself by reason of his mental strength and Christian character a following of disciples who regarded him with peculiar affection and treasure their association with him as one of the most valued memories of their lives.

At its special meeting the board made arrangements for the three synods, having charge of the Theological Seminary, to meet in special session, and directed its secretary to address to the synods an overture from the board setting forth the needs and conditions of the institution. Apprehensive of the death of Dr. Rupp, and mindful of the physical condition of Dr. Gerhart, this overture was subject to modification, and, in fact, was necessarily modified by the events as they successively occurred. It will be found in full in the minutes of synod.

The annual meeting of the board was held in Lancaster, May 3, 1904.

At this session only two professors were present: Rev. G. W. Richards, D.D., Professor of Church History was in Europe, Dr. Rupp, as stated, had gone to his reward, and Dr. Gerhart was ill. A heavy cloud hung over the institution. It was relieved in part by the fact that the professors had unselfishly taken the extra work of Dr. Rupp's department, and the examinations and graduating exercises showed that the students had been under good training.

Dr. Gerhart was permitted to labor to the close of the seminary year. His last public appearance was at the chapel on May 1, when the baccalaureate sermon was, at his request, preached by the writer. On that occasion he met the class, gave his directions with his wonted precision and led the faculty and class to their place in the college chapel. His last official work was the annual report of the faculty. This document which shows his usual care and accuracy of statement, and which is written in part by himself, and in part by his wife and Dr. Bowman, at Dr. Gerhart's dictation, came into the hands of the writer by reason of his official relation to the

Board of Visitors, and has been placed by him in the archives of the "Historical Society of the Reformed Church in the United States." Just as the seminary year closed this revered and faithful servant of God fell asleep, his death having occurred on May 6, 1904.

At the annual session of the board Dr. Bowman handed his resignation to the board, and through it to the Synod of the Potomac.

At this time of depression we were cheered by the magnanimous action of Dr. Gast by which the anxiety of the board with regard to his department was relieved. By the surrender of a part of his salary, to be applied to the support of an assistant in the Old Testament Department, Dr. Gast enabled the board to make such appointment. Rev. Irvine Hoch DeLong, a graduate of the institution, well known to Semitic Scholars and highly recommended, was chosen, and it is expected that he will enter upon his labors in the seminary in September of this year.

Such was the situation in May, 1904. At no time in the history of this venerable institution was the condition of its affairs so fraught with anxiety to its friends. But the situation was the result of causes that arose in the ordinary course of nature and were beyond the control of man.

In accordance with the action of the board, the synods were called to meet in special session June 14, 1904. The Eastern Synod met in Reading, and elected Rev. Theodore F. Herman to the chair of Systematic Theology.

The Synod of the Potomac met in Carlisle, accepted the resignation of Dr. Bowman, and elected Rev. Wm. C. Schaeffer, D.D., to the chair of New Testament Exegesis.

The Pittsburgh Synod met in Pittsburgh and elected Rev. John C. Bowman, D.D., to the chair of Practical Theology.

Rev. Theo. F. Herman declined the call tendered him by the Eastern Synod, which synod met in special session in Reading, September 6, and elected Rev. Christopher Noss.

All the above elections and the appointment of Mr. DeLong were confirmed.

Remembering our sense of loss by reason of the death of two such men as Doctors Gerhart and Rupp, and the proposed retirement of Dr. Bowman, we have reason for profound gratitude that the vacancies were filled so promptly and so satisfactorily to all concerned.

The inauguration of Professor Bowman was conducted in the presence of the Pittsburgh Synod at its annual session in Berlin, Pa., October 22, 1904.

The inauguration of Professor Scheaffer and that of Professor Noss were held in Santee Hall, Lancaster, Pa., January 13, 1905.

The full program of these respective services, the addresses made on the occasions by the appointees of synod, and by the professors elect have since been published in a pamphlet of 76 pages and are now before the Church.

The work has been well done so far as the arrangement and typographical work are concerned. For an event so prominent in the history of our institution, the committee might have issued the volume in more handsome form. As it is we have nothing but the contents and cover; "only this and nothing more." Perhaps the committee felt that the simplicity of the pamphlet accords with the past history of the Church. Once again, as so often before, do we find, on looking into this volume, that while in form unpretentious, it is solid and excellent in contents. We commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Church, and with the assertion that the impression upon the minds of those who read it will be one of gratification that the synods have called the three men who are not only well known but give in these addresses such fair promise of earnest, progressive, and successful work in their respective departments.

The inaugural address, of Rev. John C. Bowman, D.D.: *The Functions of the Theological School; What Should be its Attitude to the Old Faith and to the New?*

In this inaugural address the author faces that aspect of modern thought which is regarded by many as a menace to

Christian faith and which has been disturbing to the peace and comfort of many in the church, as known under the names of higher-criticism or new theology. It can be seen that the author does not accept all so-called higher-criticism as "higher," nor all so-called new theology as "new." He does not discuss the results of such labors or views, but defines the proper attitude of the school of theology towards the spirit of inquiry as it now prevails. He lays emphasis upon the function of the theological seminary as a training school for candidates for the holy ministry. This emphasis runs throughout the address and must be held in mind if due credit is to be given to its thought. The school is to deal with men. Men are first, doctrinal position is secondary. Its function is to bring its students into closer harmony with the mind and spirit of Christ Himself, rather than to fill their minds with definitions concerning Christ. It aims at loyalty to Christ as more than loyalty to doctrine; and to make Christ the measure of doctrine rather than doctrine the measure of Christ. Nothing is said against the importance and need of doctrine, but the standpoint of the student is to be Christ and through Him to the doctrine, rather than to make doctrine the standpoint from which to approach Christ. To this end he emphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit who has been given to guide us into all truth, not only in a given age, but through all ages; "the revelation of God as contained in the Sacred Scriptures," as the ultimate authority for faith; a liberal mind towards all truth however discovered and presented, and from whatever source of knowledge it may be obtained; and an adherence to the Heidelberg catechism as containing the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, to which it is subordinate.

The address stands in sympathy with a progressive theology, not a dead theology, but has no sneering reflections to make upon the doctrines wrought out in the past. It rather cites the example of those who have added so much to the results of faith and knowledge as a stimulus to make as due account of our present opportunities as they did of theirs, and by so

doing to relieve the statement of truth from such expressions as we have outgrown, and which were due to the historical conditions of the age which produced them. It not only maintains the right of the school of theology to apply the results of modern research to the old system of doctrinal belief, but affirms this to be a duty, for which work the author lays stress upon spiritual guidance which should be sought and used in harmony with scientific inquiry, to which inquiry the spiritual guidance is superior.

That portion of the address which dwells upon the office of the Holy Spirit as guiding into all truth is perhaps the finest part of all (p. 17). It is here that the preacher and pastor, with the care of souls resting upon him, no less than the teacher of theology, speaks, and speaks with beauty of expression and force of thought. While there are a number of expressions we could quote with profit, there is one we cannot afford to omit. "The denomination exists not for itself but in and for the Church Catholic." This has the true Reformed ring. It is far away from the narrow view which would hedge in the Church, not from the sinful world, but from other denominations, and make growth at the expense of liberality. And we submit that the spirit of liberality which has marked our seminary professors is due to the fact that they are true to the spirit and genius of the Reformed Church. There is always the danger that liberality may go too far in its expression. This, however, can be more easily corrected where the faith is sound than can the narrow view which is almost always burdened by an incurable self-satisfaction, and is unable to differentiate the spirit of the church from the spirit of the age and accept the truth in the latter which may be struggling for expression.

Attention is also called to the author's recognition of the importance of theology. The emphasis which he lays upon the function of the theological school to train men for the ministry of Christ rather than to train theologians does not grow out of a lack of appreciation of the importance of theol-

ogy, but rather lends emphasis to his recognition of its importance which runs through the whole address.

Inaugural address, by Rev. Christopher Noss: *Scientific Theology*.

In an introduction the author presents the relation of culture to Christian work and claims for dogmatics its position among the sciences. His position is clearly stated in the first sentence: "Culture is subordinate to the Spirit of God." From this point he never swerves. That this is not merely a cant phrase or a passing thought thrown out to satisfy a conservative orthodoxy is seen from the fact that while the address shows a remarkable versatility the author never trips himself on this point, nor verges from the line marked by his first sentence. The fact is with him a conviction which, like the love of a mother for her child, is not paraded in assertions, but breathes through the address, as the mother's love expresses itself in all her relations to her offspring. The author is true to the traditions of the church in demanding room for the free exercise of the scientific spirit in the domain of the Christian life. He recognizes that scientific knowledge is not necessary to Christian faith, but far from putting a premium on ignorance, he demands that the Christian minister should be at the same time the careful and laborious student, and should make the best use of the means of culture within his reach. He pays tribute to the great service which science has rendered to faith, pleads for a proper relation between the two, and welcomes the former as a messenger of truth, not because he is blind to the fact that it has often been arrayed against faith, but because of his conviction of the triumph of truth.

In four sections he discusses: the character of the modern scientific spirit; the unfortunate estrangement between science and theology, due to the arrogancy of theology to science and that of science to theology; the recognition of authority as essential to true work in both departments. From this discussion the author proceeds to present six characteristics

of a sound scientific theology, which may be thus briefly stated: (1) Loyalty to all truth. (2) A consistent apprehension of the essential contents of Christian faith in its relation to the conditions of the age. (3) Christian consciousness essential to the Christian theologian. (4) Proper recognition of the past. (5) The authority of the Sacred Scriptures. (6) The Christocentric principle; Christ the key to the problems of faith. To review these several sections of the address would call for more quotations than would be desirable. We may say in general that the address is a manly plea for the independence both of science and faith; an independence, however, under authority, and not mere license. It recognizes the great service science has done for theology in magnifying the order of the universe. It holds that there is no necessary antagonism between science and faith, even though the modern scientific spirit would, if it could, eliminate God from the universe, and the dogmatic spirit would coerce science by limiting the range of its free thinking. Both, to be true, must be under authority. The recognition of this fact should make them more charitable the one towards the other. All facts are to be welcomed by the theologian as contributions from a sister science, and all truth must be welcomed by him even though it may compel a readjustment of his position towards what he has regarded and may still regard as fundamentals.

The address is written in a lighter vein than that which usually marks such productions, but not at the sacrifice of thought. Its vivacity makes it pleasant reading and this by some will be regarded as its principal charm. Such readers will find, however, that it demands careful thought and compels them to stop and consider.

The address is positive, clear, insists on the rights of faith and affirms that revelation cannot contradict reason nor can it be true to itself if it ignores the rights of reason.

As we read the closing part of the address our memory carried us back to our Mercersburg training and to our faithful teacher, when urging us to commit the Scripture, quoting

Psalm XIX., and showing that the book of nature and the word of God, since they both declare the same author, must be in essential agreement. The teacher lives in his pupil and successor, who in this address gives the promise that the hopes of the Synod which called him to his important position will be more than fulfilled.

Inaugural address, by William C. Schaeffer: The Person and the Mind of Christ.

The subject of this address is well chosen. The time will never come when the question of Jesus "What think ye of Christ?" will not press for an answer. Happily this question can be answered in a satisfactory way by him who finds in Christ his Saviour; but no answer of any single age can be so exhaustive as to do for all time. Those who think, as some now think, that there is no need to make further inquiry as to the subject of the question find themselves surrounded by the most thoughtful and earnest men who are devoting themselves to this very inquiry, and who show that in their search for the truth they find that the question concerning Christ relates itself to every important interest of man both in this life and in that which is to come.

The estimate of the Apostles and of the Church, as shown in the writings of the former and in the creeds of the latter, together with the importance which attaches to a correct view of Christ for the individual Christian, and the necessity for him to see for himself what the disciples saw, is the main thought of the introduction clearly presented in its six paragraphs.

The impression made upon the minds of the disciples that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; the growth of this impression into the conviction of faith; the expression of this faith in their attitude towards Christ and in the Scriptures; the confession of this same faith by the East and the West, the Greek, the Roman and the Protestant, are all sound reasons for its confession by the individual. Due account must

be made of these facts by any honest searcher for truth, whatever his attitude to Christ may be. But the individual must apprehend for himself the truth and not possess it at second hand.

The attainment of such knowledge is to be gained by a knowledge of the mind of Christ. Other sources of knowledge may be accepted as true; yet, without denying their truth, conviction must be reached in another way, that is, through Christ Himself. Christ alone could know the mystery of His own being. From Him the disciples learned and from Him must every believer learn. From Him every believer can learn. There is a revelation of the mind of Christ ready for him who truly desires it. This comes to us through those who knew Him. The mind of Jesus became the mind of His disciples, not alone by their knowledge and remembrance of His teaching, but by sharing His spirit. "He touched the hearts of His disciples with live coals from the altar of truth; and under the inspiration of His spirit they had a vision of the truth for themselves." Such knowledge of Christ demands a moral harmony with the Spirit of Christ. The possession of the words of Christ supported by the strongest evidence that they are His very words is not sufficient. His words were heard by those who rejected Him. But he who is of the truth, who wills to do the will of God, who stands in harmony with the heart and life of Jesus, will discern the truth. As the mind of Christ is the mind of His disciples because they were united to Him in heart and life, so the mind of Christ becomes the mind of the believer to-day. This opens to him the fountain of truth found not only in the words of Jesus but in those of the apostles. They will hear His words because they are of the truth; because they through the Spirit come to realize the will of Christ in obedience. And having come to the knowledge of Christ in the same way as did the apostles, they will feel and recognize the truth of the apostles' teaching. "Neither pray I for these alone but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." Harmony with the Spirit

of Christ makes real to them the words of those who give us the mind of Christ. The guidance of the Holy Spirit first, and an intelligent and reverent criticism under the guidance of the Spirit is demanded for a safe interpretation of the Scriptures as containing the teaching of Jesus. The simple faith of the believer, the spiritual insight which comes from the spirit of Christ in the heart, the apprehension of His mind by obedience to the Divine Will, and reverent unbiased scholarship unite in the testimony that the mind of Jesus is, that He is the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, sinless and perfect while human, the everblessed mediator between God and man. Thus we may apprehend Him if we permit ourselves to be apprehended of Him by faith and obedience to His holy will.

The subject of the address is discussed under the three divisions:

- I. The Mind of Christ the Interpretation of His Person.
- II. How the Mind of Christ is Revealed to Us.
- III. What the Mind of Christ is.

We quote the language of another as applied to the above address, "Humble, reverent, convincing and hopeful; bearing the stamp of a careful and well furnished workman."

We find in the above addresses the confidence and repose of faith, and a charming fearlessness with which they look to the future. This is right. The attitude of faith is repose, notwithstanding the grave fears which have been excited by some of the assertions of modern teaching as made by those who claim to be leaders in Christian thought. The Church must have an unshaken confidence in the power of her divine-human Head to still the raging of intellectual elements as completely as He stilled the tempest on the sea. In this age the fundamental truths of Christianity have been assailed and our religious feeling has been shocked by criticism irreverent in tone and breathing a spirit of disregard for the word of God. Fear as to the results of such teaching, results such as followed the wave of German rationalism, are not inconsistent with a firm

faith in the ultimate triumph of truth. But a vigorous defence of truth is demanded, and for this we must look to our "Teachers of Theology." They have been "set for the defence of the Gospel." Upon them rests a responsibility so grave that it should beget in them an extreme caution in statement. In some portions of the pamphlet under review there is a lack in this direction. Certain expressions are startling, to say the least, and inconsistent with the truth presented, while there seems to have been some "writing at random." Nevertheless we acknowledge our admiration for the ability shown in these productions, and congratulate the Church on her choice of men for the honorable and important positions which the authors fill.

III.

THE SACRIFICIAL TYPES OF CHRIST THE EXPONENTS OF THE ATONEMENT.*

REV. HIRAM KING, D.D.

The purpose of divine revelation, it is plain, is the spiritual enlightenment of man and the knowledge of spiritual truth is imparted to him either through the mental intuitions or by *intelligible* communications. Thus the medium of natural revelation is the intuitive reason which is the mental equipment of man in his subconscious being, and he not only knows by nature that there is a God but he also worships Him, although he necessarily pays his devotions at the altar which is inscribed "To an unknown God" (Acts 17: 23). In direct revelation, however, the medium of communication is not only speech, but the divine declarations are actually made in the vernacular of man himself and are thus addressed directly to his *understanding*. It is, moreover, in man's own *handwriting* that verbal revelation is recorded in the Bible under purpose of its Author to communicate to the entire race the knowledge of His attributes and will, the origin of the universe, the fall of man and the redemption and glorification of the world in the Messianic advent.

As, now, the Scriptures are "inspired of God" (II Tim. 3: 16), it follows, not only that they are the correct record of revelation, but also that they contain the Word of God, and that God therefore speaks perpetually to man from the pages

* The ultimate authority of the Scriptures over logic is affirmed in the opening paragraphs of this paper because the Word of God must be final for its own doctrines. As to the interpretation of the Scriptures, it is assumed that the words of the sacred writings, like the words of secular writings, are meant to bear the linguistic values for which they stand and must, accordingly, be taken to mean what they plainly say. The exegesis given is therefore *prima facie*.

of the Bible. As, moreover, the author of revelation has not issued a revised edition of the Bible, it follows that He continues to address man in the terms of the original communications. As, furthermore, the Bible contains the record of the moral and spiritual utterances of God to man, it follows that the doctrines of the Church must not only be derived *exclusively* from the Scriptures, but also that the Scriptures are the exclusive standard of their orthodoxy.* As, finally, it was for the world's *enlightenment* that the Author of revelation dictated the Books of the Bible to His Old and New Testament amanuenses, it is plainly to be inferred that the interpretation of the Scriptures in their most *obvious* significance is their true exegesis.

As the Scriptures are thus the authoritative formulation of revealed truth in the language of man himself, the question arises, how is the doctrinal diversity to be accounted for which has broken up the organic unity of Christendom and made seetism chronic? The history of doctrines, it is replied, warrants the accusation that dogmatic aberrations are due, not to lack of Biblical *perspicuity* but to *extra-Biblical* theories. Thus, for example, the ordinance of Baptism is rated as a non-gracebearing ceremony in the popular evangelistic practices of the day, although the Scriptures declare that men must be "born of water and the Spirit" to become citizens of the Kingdom of God (John 3: 5), that they are "baptized into Christ" (Gal. 3: 27), that in their personal submission to the rite they "wash away" their sins (Acts 22: 16) and that baptism itself is the "washing (laver) of regeneration" (Titus 3: 5). That logic has, in like-manner, been substituted for revelation in the discussion of the doctrine of the atonement is not even doubtful, since the outcome of the contention has been the formation of *theories* of the atonement by *reasoning* rather than the formulation of the *doctrine* of the

* Doctrines are usually logical as well as Scriptural, but the employment of logic in *contravention* of the Scriptures is necessarily vitiating and wholly without warrant in the formulation of doctrine.

atonement by *interpreting the Scriptures*. Indeed exegesis itself, on which doctrinal *certitude* is conditioned, has been superseded, in the main, by doctrinal theories, which are *hypothetical* propositions, and the atonement is changed from a fact of revelation to a problem in logic.

It is plainly not on the reason, however, that the doctrine of the atonement is conditioned but on revelation. Nor ought it to be impossible to formulate the doctrine from the interpretation of the Scriptures, pure and simple, since they not only speak of the great redemptive tragedy from the third chapter of Genesis to the close of the sacred canon but they also speak of it *intelligibly*.

The issue in the long-drawnout controversy concerning the nature of the atonement is, at ground, whether or not Christ suffered the *penalty* for the "sin of the world" which He "taketh away" (John 1: 29) through His death.

It was the mission of John to mediate faith in the Messiah at His advent and he pointed Him out, not as the world's promised Deliverer (Gen. 3: 15), nor yet as its prospective Ruler (Dan. 7: 14), but most significantly as the *victim of a sacrifice in its behalf*. In evident allusion to Levitical offering for sin he cried: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1: 29).

The Baptist's proclamation resolves itself into the following propositions: (1) That Christ would be offered by divine decree: (2) that Christ would be offered in expiation for sin; (3) that it would be by the sacrifice of Christ that the atonement would be made.

It will facilitate the search for truth to assume, at this point, the Old Testament ritual for typical offerings for sin, and ascertain the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures relative to John's heraldic proclamation of their Antitype. Do, then, the later Scriptures justify the proclamation? and is it the true portrayal of Christ in His subsequent passion? Yes, as the affirmation of the analytic propositions will show:

1. *It was by divine decree that Christ was offered.*—It is

the record of the Gospels that Christ, in fulfillment of the protevangel (Gen. 3: 15), experienced the deadly hostility of the "serpent" who attempted His destruction through Herod and His later enemies among the rulers of the Jews, and succeeded, finally, in "bruising" His "heel" under Pontius Pilate. While Satan, however, inspired the death of Christ (Lu. 22: 3) to make the removal of sin impossible, he unwittingly executed the divine decree for the atonement, instead. Not only did he fail to falsify the protevangel, but, in making the attempt, he became the instrument of its fulfillment. He crucified Christ to frustrate the purpose of His earthly mission, but he brought to pass, on the contrary, the sacrificial consummation of His advent, since it was plainly at Calvary that God "set forth" Christ "to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood" (Ro. 3: 25) and that He "delivered him up for us all" (8: 32); just as in an earlier age the Gentile Nebuchadnezzar became the unwitting "servant" of God for the execution of His punitive decrees against the offending nations (Jer. 25: 29; 27: 6; 43: 10), although the personal incentive of the great soldier for their conquest was quite plainly his ambition. It was, moreover, implied in John's metaphorical designation of Christ as the "Lamb of God" that He would be offered by divine decree, since He could not possibly have *been* the Lamb of God if God had not provided Him for sacrifice. And, furthermore, the Lord Himself unequivocally affirmed the divine appointment of His passion at His arrest. "Put up the sword in the sheath," He said to His impetuous defender: "the cup which the *Father hath given me*, shall I not drink it" (John 18: 11)?

2. *It was in expiation for sin that Christ was offered.*—Christ's spiritual headship of mankind is here assumed. As man, however, fell prior to the advent of Christ, it follows that, although personally without sin, He became *constructively* accountable for the fallen condition of the race through the assumption of its headship. He thus became the generic representative of man, not in his original holiness but in his

moral defilement. Does revelation, however, confirm the conclusion of logic? and did the incarnation really involve Christ in the fall of man? The Scriptures declare in decisive affirmation that Him "who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf" (II Cor. 5: 21) and that He became a "curse for us" (Gal. 3: 13). Having thus become accountable for the sins of the race in His advent, He was "delivered up for our trespasses" (Ro. 4: 25) and was "offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9: 28).

Not only, however, did God "deliver up" Christ to death but He also forsook Him on the cross (Matt. 27: 46). He thus excluded Him from tripersonal communion in the God-head and made His sufferings extreme as the consequent cry of horror which He uttered fully attests. God's abandonment of Christ, though a negative act, was nevertheless a *penal infliction*, since it is inconceivable, not only that He who is "love" in essence would deny the comfort of His presence to His suffering Son, but also that He would measurelessly augment His agony by voluntarily withdrawing from Him, except on the ground that the Sufferer was indeed bearing "our sins in his body upon the tree" as the Scriptures declare, and that He was undergoing thus *negatively* the infliction of the "stripes" by which the world was to be healed (I Peter 2: 24).

3. *It was by the sacrifice of Christ that the atonement was made.*—The purpose of Christ's passion as the Scriptures declare in unmistakable terms, was the restoration of the broken union between God and man, or to make the atonement. Thus He was "offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. 9: 28) and He "suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God" (I Peter 3: 18).

As to the parties at variance, the Scriptures affirm the atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, point blank, toward each. Thus from the standpoint of *God's wrath* (Ro. 1: 18; Ep. 5: 6), Christ is not only characterized in general as "*a propitiation*, through faith, by his blood" (Ro. 3: 25), but He

is also designated specifically as "*the propitiation for our sins*" (I John 2: 2). From the standpoint of *man's enmity* (Ro. 8: 7; Jas. 4: 4), it is declared that "we are reconciled through the death of his Son" (Ro. 5: 10), that it was the good pleasure of the Father "through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the *blood of his cross*" (Col. 1: 20) and that Christ reconciled both Jew and Gentile in one body unto God "through the cross" (Ep. 2: 16).

Not only, however, was the Messianic proclamation of the Baptist formulated with reference to Jewish sacrifices, but the proclamation itself was virtually the announcement that Old Testament offering for sin would be abrogated by the sacrifice of Christ which would be the supersedure of the "shadow of the good things to come" (Heb. 10: 1) by their substance of deliverance from sin as the historical outcome of the entire system of typical sacrifice for sin. As the sacrificial slaying of the Lamb of God would abolish sin, it is plain that Levitical offering for sin would thereafter be wholly lacking both in expiatory virtue and in typical significance.

It has now developed beyond a doubt that Christ, the Lamb which God himself provided for the *ultimate* sacrifice for sin, was the antitype of the Old Testament sacrifices for sin from the institution of the Theocracy. And as antitypes are the *originals* of their types, it follows that the types of Christ were projected into the Mosaic ritual by Christ himself in His *ideal* relation to the theocratic constitution, as at once is producing cause, its constant inspiration and its prospective sacrificial climax. As, moreover, the adverb "anti" when prefixed to type means *in correspondence to*, it follows that the Old Testament types of Christ were the *metaphorical likenesses* of Christ. In their ceremonial significance, therefore, the sacrificial types of Christ, although not His functional substitutes, were yet His functional *adumbrations*. The Old Testament offerings for sin were thus not only the typical representations of the subsequent offering of Christ for sin, but they were also His typical *prefigurations*.

The Levitical sacrifices for sin having thus been offered in *prophetic similitude* of Christ in His passion, it follows conclusively that they are the *exponents* of the atonement which He wrought in their antitypal fulfillment.

If, now, the propositions derived from John's heraldic proclamation can be affirmed of the Old Testament typical offerings for sin as they have just been affirmed of Christ, their antitype, not only will the general correspondence of the sin-offering at Calvary to the sin-offering in the temple appear, but the penal suffering of Christ for sin will be demonstrated.

The sacrificial idea became complete at Sinai, but it was exemplified in its *analysis* in the Mosaic ritual and the offerings were prescribed specifically for its constituent elements, namely, the sin-offerings for *propitiation*, the burnt-offerings for *self-consecration* and the meat-offerings for *thanksgiving*. Of these offerings, the first class were appointed for the typical prefiguration of the sacrifice of Christ and they alone concern the central theme of this discussion. As, moreover, the sin-offering of the two goats on the Day of Atonement was the most complete of the types of Christ in His passion, it alone will be considered in affirming the propositions in question.

1. *Were the two goats, like Christ, offered by divine decree?*—At the institution of the sacrifice for Levitical atonement, God directed Aaron the priest, through Moses, to take "of the congregation of the children of Israel two he-goats for a sin-offering" (Lev. 16: 5), "to cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for Azazel" (v. 8), to present the goat upon which the lot fell for the Lord, and offer him for a sin-offering (v. 9), but to set the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, "alive before the Lord, to make atonement for him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness" (v. 10). The actual offering of the goats was also made by divine direction quite as explicit as was their selection for the sacrifice: "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with his blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and

sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat" (v. 15). As to the goat for Azazel, it was directed: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live-goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness" (v. 21).

Clearly, then, God himself appointed the typical offering of the two goats, just as He provided the "Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" in antitypal fulfillment of the typical prophesy.

2. *Were the two goats, like Christ, offered in expiation for sin?*—The two goats were a sin-offering, although, like Christ their antitype, they were not sinful agents. Like Him, they "knew no sin" but were "made to be sin" on behalf of the Jewish people, just as He was "made to be sin on our behalf." In their sacrificial significance, the two goats were different, but they were the mutual complements of an offering which was made for *atonement* and was therefore *expiatory* in its nature. Aaron, the priest, was directed to kill the goat that was "for the people" and to sprinkle his blood "within the veil" (Lev. 16: 15), "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins" (v. 16), just as Christ, the Antitypal High Priest, "offered up himself" for the "sins of the people" (Heb. 7: 27), and, "through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place" of the "greater and more perfect tabernacle," "having obtained eternal redemption" (9: 11, 12). The instructions for the sacrifice of the goat for Azazel were the following: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness: "And the goat shall bear upon him all their

iniquities into a solitary land: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness" (Lev. 16: 21, 22). The hard fate of the goat for Azazel was as plainly in expiation for the sins of the people, which he bore on his head under ceremonial imposition, as was the actual slaying of his sacrificial associate and he was beyond controversy the typical prefiguration of the antitypal victim upon whom the Lord subsequently laid the "iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53: 6), and who "bare our sins in his body upon the tree" (I Peter 2: 24).

3. *Was it by the sacrifice of the two goats that the Levitical atonement was made?*—It was the purpose of the day appointed for the offering of the goats "to make atonement for you before the Lord your God." "For on this day," it was urged for its proper observance, "shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord" (Lev. 16: 30). Was it, however, by the offering under consideration that the atonement was made? Yes. Thus the high priest killed the goat that was for the people and sprinkled his blood at the mercy-seat, because of their "uncleanness" and "transgressions, even all their sins." Over the live goat he confessed "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins," and sent him into the wilderness "to bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land."

It is thus as plain as language can be made to express meaning that it was by sacrificing the goats for a sin-offering that Levitical atonement was made. The goat that was for the people was slain and the priest "made atonement" for them with his blood, just as the Lamb that was for the world was slain and purchased unto God *with His blood* men of every nation (Rev. 5: 9). It was thus the blood of the slain goat that cleansed the tabernacle from the "uncleanness of the children of Israel" (Lev. 16: 19), just as it is the blood of Christ that "cleanseth us from all sin" (I John 1: 7). It was by bearing the iniquities of the children of Israel "upon him" unto a solitary land (Lev. 16: 22) that the live goat made

complete Levitical atonement for sin, just as it was by bearing our sins "in his body" upon the tree (1 Peter 2: 24) that Christ made true atonement for sin.

The two goats were, accordingly, the divinely constituted *proxy* of the people under penalty for sin, and it follows, most plainly, that in the offering of the goats the divine decree that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ez. 18: 4) was *averted from the people and executed upon the victims of the sacrifice*. The one goat suffered actual death; the other goat suffered its equivalent of banishment from the shelter of the fold and the care of the shepherd into the deadly conditions of the wilderness. As the goats thus suffered the penalty of death for the sins of the Jewish people, the innocent for the guilty, it is perfectly plain that they were the *propitiation* for their sins, just as Christ who "suffered for our sins, the righteous for the unrighteous" is "the propitiation for our sins."

It has now appeared, in affirmation of the three propositions, that the sacrifice of the two goats on the Day of Atonement to take away the sins of the Jewish people was, beyond doubt, the typical prefiguration and prophetic similitude of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God on Good-Friday "which taketh away the sin of the world." The *correspondence* of type and antitype has been clearly shown: The goat for the people was slain for their sins; "Christ died for our sins." The scape-goat bore "upon him" all their iniquities "unto a solitary land"; "Christ bare our sins *in his body* upon the tree."

The complete correspondence, in their *expiatory significance*, of typical offering for sin in the temple and antitypal offering for sin at Calvary, it must be granted, is plainly a corroborative demonstration of the *penal** sufferings of Christ for the "sin of the world" which He "taketh away" through His death. Christ therefore wrought the atonement through the expiation of sin in His passion.

* As the "stripes" which were laid on the Sufferer at Calvary are *remedial* for the race (1 Peter 2: 24), the inference is quite plainly warranted that their infliction on the expiatory Representative of the race was the penal expression of the divine love as the *motive* of the atonement (1 John 4: 10).

Is, however, the doctrine of the atonement, as now set forth, *reasonable* as well as Scriptural? and was the death of Christ under penalty for man's sin in harmony with ethical principle? Yes, atonement for man's sin through the penal suffering of Christ is both reasonable and moral. Christ Himself took care to explain that it was not His mission "to destroy, but to fulfill" the Mosaic law (Matt. 5: 17), and as the legal institutions of Moses were truly *theocratic*, they were necessarily based on the moral law. It therefore follows that it was not in contravention of the moral law but under its sanction that Christ "suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous" in antitypal fulfillment of the Mosaic typical offering for sin.

As sin belongs to the sphere of morals, it cannot, it is true, be transferred from one man to another for its expiation, either by ceremonial imposition or by voluntary assumption. The commission of sin not only implies the moral agency of the sinner, but it also bears witness to his moral depravity and gives expression to the evil that is in his heart. As evil therefore inheres in the sinner and is exemplified in his life by the deeds of the flesh, it is quite impossible to relieve him of personal accountability for the commission of sin by constituting his fellowman his penal proxy. But that is not what occurred at the advent and in the passion of Christ. The Lord, it is true, "laid on Him the iniquity of us all," but He did not transfer our *personal* sins to Him.

The relation of Christ to man is complex. He was "born of the Virgin Mary" and is a member of the race, although He was "conceived by the Holy Ghost." He is therefore in *individual* relation to man by His birth. In view, however, of the personal accountability of men for sin, it is quite plain that the *genealogical* relation of Christ to the world could not become *soteriological*. He could not possibly suffer the penalty for the "sin of the world" in His individual relationship to men, since the transfer of personal sin from one moral agent to another is debarred by moral principle as even the

primer in ethical science teaches. With the dead, the living, the unborn merely His *fellow-members* of the race, although Himself the mighty Son of God, Christ could not have become the Saviour of the world, but the moral conditions would have made His crucifixion, like the penal death of Socrates, only the tragic ending of a virtuous life.

But then the genealogical relation of Christ to man, although essential to His advent and mission, is only His subordinate relation to him. His predominant relation is *progenitorial*, and is not primarily conditioned on lineal descent but on incarnation. The Person of Christ was, in fact, constituted by the "power of the Most High" (Lu. 1: 35), and His advent was the inauguration of a new order of life on the scale of being itself of which He is, by position, the generic Head.

It is by no means at haphazard that the race-Headship of Christ is here affirmed; nor is the affirmation a conclusion of logic in contravention of the Scriptures. His Headship of the race was, in fact, prefigured in secular history quite as plainly as was His death in sacred history. The Jewish types of Christ were *soteriological* and they prefigured Him as the world's deliverer. But the *ground-type* of Christ was Adam, and it prefigured Him as the generic head of spiritual humanity quite apart from Levitical rite. Thus the Scriptures not only declare that Adam "is a figure of Him that was to come" (Ro. 5: 14), but they also designate Christ outright as the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15: 45).

Christ is therefore the spiritual progenitor of the race by incarnation, just as Adam is its natural progenitor by creation. Each is the progenitorial fountain of life for the race which is *theanthropic* from Christ and *anthropic* from Adam. Each shaped the possible destiny of the race prior to the exercise of the progenitorial function. At the fateful tree the race was doomed to death through the sin of its natural progenitor, Adam; on the cross, the seal of death was broken through the atonement of its spiritual progenitor, Christ.

It has already been found that moral accountability cannot

be transferred from one moral agent to another, either by imposition or assumption. Moral conditions are, however, at the ground of moral being and they are transmitted from progenitor to progeny in birth. The proposition is, accordingly, affirmed that it is by *progenitorial qualities* that the moral condition of man is primarily determined. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" is the verbal embodiment of a law that is quite inexorable in the moral world as well as in the vegetable kingdom. The fall of Adam and the redemption by Christ were the acts, respectively, of the two progenitors of the race, and it follows from the nature of their race-relationship that each committed man to the moral conditions created by his own agency. The fall was the *personal* act of the "first man Adam," but the moral degeneration of the natural race from the Garden-gate itself bears witness to the true *progenitorial* character of his sin. The atonement was the *personal* act of the "last Adam," but the moral elevation of the new race from Pentecost onward conclusively attests the truly *progenitorial* character of His expiation.

As, now, the soteriological relation of Christ to man is thus primarily *progenitorial* and not *individual*, it follows that He suffered the penalty for the sin of the world, not in its *personal* expression, but at its *ground* and in its *root*, as it inheres in human nature through Adam. The truth of the affirmation is apparent from the nature of the incarnation which is not the *conjunctive* but the *constituent* union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. The autonomy of each of the two natures is merged in the functional oneness of both and the person of Christ is not a duality but a unity. His human nature, like His divine nature, is accordingly a constituent of His *Messianic Being*. Of the correctness of this conclusion there can be no doubt, since He designates Himself as the "Son of man" (John, 5: 27) quite as distinctly as the "Son of God" (v. 25).

As human nature was, however, under the law of sin and

death (Ro. 5: 12) at its assumption by Christ, it is plain that its incorporation into His being, to constitute Him the "last Adam," necessarily imposed on Him the accountability for the inhering race-sin.

Christ was thus truly progenitorial for the spiritual race in His passion, just as Adam was progenitorial for the natural race in his sin. As therefore Christ atoned for the "sin of the world," not in *individual* relationship to the sinners, but wholly *within His own person as the spiritual Adam*, it follows, not only that His death under penalty for man's sin was in harmony with moral principle, but also that it was really by the *operation* of the moral law that He suffered the penal infliction.

As, now, Christ, the "last Adam," atoned in His person for the race-sin, and as the spiritual race was *potential* in Him at His passion, it follows that the atonement becomes efficacious for men at the *inception of their spiritual existence in generation from His glorified person*. As, moreover, the conception of Christ by the Holy Spirit was an act of *creation* and human nature was *regenerated* in the constitution of His person, it follows that He became the head of the race, not in the old order of the world's life but in the *new creation*. It is therefore plain that the fountain "for sin and uncleanness" (Zec. 13: 1) which was opened at Pentecost does not cleanse the natural man from moral taint and restore him to the lost Paradise, but that personal sin can be removed only in the higher order of the new creation of which the incarnation, or the constitution of the person of Christ in His nativity, was the historical institution. The sacrifice of Good-Friday would indeed be altogether unavailing without its culmination in the grace of Pentecost, and it is not doubtful that it is in man's transition from the first creation to the new creation, in spiritual generation from Christ glorified, that he is freed from sin: "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold they are become new" (2 Cor. 5: 17).

In the *economy* of grace, however, the new creation is necessarily conditioned on the new birth, or individual generation from the person of Christ, and although man does not lose his *personal* identity as he is thus "begotten of God," he is nevertheless no longer fully identical with his former self in his *personal being*. He is not only a "new creature," but he is also a "babe in Christ." He has, in fact, received spiritual being at its progenitorial source in Christ, just as he received natural being at its progenitorial source in Adam. While, therefore, he is "earthly" from the "first man," he is "heavenly" from the "second man" (I Cor. 15: 47, 48); while he is anthropic from Adam, he is theanthropic from Christ.

It is now plain that man is not fully identical with his former self in his personal being as the grace of Pentecost makes the atonement availing for him in the new birth, but that he partakes of the "divine nature" as the Scriptures declare (2 Peter, 1: 4) and is in the order of the new creation of which his spiritual progenitor, Christ, is the author.

As, now, man is brought into spiritual being at the fountain of the world's spiritual race-life in Christ, in the constitution of whose person sin was *eradicated* from human nature, it follows from the laws of progeniture that the stainless moral qualities of Christ are transmitted to him by hereditary entailment, and the inference is warranted that man, in the new creation, is *normally without sin*. In full justification of the inference the Scriptures declare that "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God" (1 John, 3: 9) and that "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but he that was begotten of God keepeth him[self], and the evil one touches him not" (5: 18). In personal regeneration man is renewed at the base of his being and the *real* man is the "new man, which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" (Ep. 4: 24). In his normal state he does no *voluntary* wrong (Ro. 7: 19) and his *involuntary* wrongdoing is attributed by the Scriptures to the mandation

of the law of sin which is in his "members" (v. 23). This pernicious *alter ego* in the personality of new-created man is, however, the "old man" which was "crucified" with Christ (Ro. 6: 6) and will perish lingeringly in the progress of personal sanctification (Ep. 4: 22-24).

IV.

THE CORRECTION OF MAN'S ABNORMAL CONDITION ACCORDING TO THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

REV. JAMES M. MULLAN.

Someone has said that no religion can hope to retain for long its hold on human life when once it has grown afraid to reconsider its phraseology. No doubt an urgent need of religion to-day is a modern vocabulary, in order that religious truth may be expressed in language that is as familiar to the present age as the truth itself is essential to the well-being of the times. It is probable that for this reason others have spoken of redemption as the correction of man's abnormal condition, and for like reason we have adopted this as a preferable statement of our subject.

It will be necessary first to recall briefly the teaching of Jesus concerning man's abnormal condition. That Jesus recognized sin as a fact in human experience, and considered the sinner's condition as abnormal, there are scarcely two opinions. But in what sense did Jesus consider the sinner's condition abnormal? That is the question. We must confess that we have not been able to find in the teaching of Jesus the common and familiar view of man's abnormality, namely, that it consists in an absolutely corrupt human nature, due to a primeval fall, whereby our nature became so corrupt that we are all conceived and born in sin; and are so far depraved that we are wholly unapt to any good and prone to all evil. On the contrary, we are disposed to believe with those who hold that the development of this doctrine of total depravity must be attributed to "those slanderers of the race, the theologians," who have dwelt too exclusively upon the animal inheritance

of mankind. In striking contrast to this dark picture of man as the rabbis have painted it these many centuries, stands the portraiture of him in the Gospels as it was drawn by Jesus, the friend of publicans and sinners. Horace Bushnell once said that there is an awful dignity in man's degradation. Of the sinner it has been similarly said that he is a temple in ruins, but he is a temple still. This is the conception of Jesus. The sinner is a prodigal son of God, but he is still a son. The deepest element of man's nature is not sin, not what man has made himself, but what God made him, who made him very good, in His own image and after His own likeness.

Jesus, however, as we have said, recognized sin as a fact—a fearful fact, and he looked upon it with horror. Against it he warned men as the one and only one thing to be feared, for it has within it the power to destroy both soul and body in hell. To pluck out an eye, or to cut off a hand or a foot, yea, to lose one's life, were a trifling thing compared to the destruction that sin works in the soul. No material gain, not even the whole world, can compensate a man in the least for the loss that sin entails. This is due, in the thought of Jesus, to the nature of sin as he saw it with undimmed vision. For instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, it is seen that Jesus considered sin primarily as an act of the will. A man, he said, who looks on a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery. "All these evil things," he said (fornication, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, railing, pride, foolishness)—"all these evil things—proceed from within and defile the man." The seat of man's sinfulness is not located by Jesus in an inherited and totally vitiated nature, but in the individual will. Man is not by nature a devil. Neither is he a beast. He is of more value than many sparrows. How much is he of more value than a sheep! He has the conscious power of self-assertion, and this is a divine prerogative.

"Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours to make them thine."

"God, whose pleasure brought
Man into being, stands away,
As it were, a hand-breadth off, to give
Room for the newly-made to live,
And look at Him from a place apart,
And use his gifts of brain and heart."*

Upon this as a presupposition rest the teachings of Jesus throughout concerning man, and he dealt with men accordingly. Herein, according to Jesus, lies man's abnormality as a sinner, in that he should use "his gifts of brain and heart" not in harmony with the will of God whose pleasure brought him into being, but in antagonism to it. Man is two-fold in his nature. There are repeated recognitions of this in the sayings of Jesus. He has a nature that is common to himself and beasts alike. He also has a nature that is akin to God. There are accordingly two ways in which a man may live, but not at the same time. There is an ideal order of life of which Jesus was himself the incarnation and hence he could say: "I am the way." It is the way of filial obedience, whose principle Jesus expressed when he said: "I do always the things that are pleasing to Him." There is another way in which a man may live: "One may seek first, last, and all the time, to gratify his appetites, indulge his passions, and gain his selfish ends; heedless of the bitter privations, injury, and anguish his greed and pride and lust wreak on those who cross his cruel path or fall into his hard and heartless hands."† Jesus implied as much when he significantly asked: "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" and when similarly he observed: "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." These are opposite and mutually exclusive ways, and their relation is no where better expressed than in Jesus' well-known paradox: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it"; and again in his other equally well-known words: "No man can serve two masters: for either he will

* Tennant in "The Origin of Sin."

† "Jesus Way," by Wm. DeWitt Hyde.

hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Herein is sin: not that we love self but that we love self rather than God. It is "the suicidal abasement to the things that perish of a nature destined by its constitution and structure for participation in the very being and blessedness of God." This is abnormal, because it is "the violation of our true nature, not the expression of it." Man was made for God and he finds himself only when he lives in God. When instead he chooses the life that links him to the beast, "the whole order of life is dislocated," involving in abnormality not only his relation to God but also his relation to himself and to society.* This is what Jesus said very simply and very forcibly in the parable of the Lost Son, whose restoration he characterized as a "coming to himself."

Jesus recognized the condition of man, self-estranged from God, as abnormal. What did he say concerning the correction of man's abnormal condition? It can not be doubted that the message of Jesus was distinctively a message of salvation and that he considered his mission as being inseparable from the fulfilment of his message. When upon a certain occasion fault was found with him because he ate with publicans and sinners, his reply was that he had come to call sinners; and under very similar circumstances at another time he declared that he had come to seek and to save the lost. This is the central and all pervasive teaching of the New Testament, the source of which was Jesus' own claim, that God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world should be saved through Him. It was inevitable that the conviction should fasten itself upon the mind of the Christian Church that there is no other name under heaven, given among men, wherein we must be saved, save the name of Jesus only. There are two scenes in the ministry of Jesus bearing upon

* "The Sin of Man and the Sacrifice of Christ," by Dr. Chas. Cuthbert Hall.

this subject that may be taken as typical. At the beginning of the last and fatal week of his ministry he came from Bethany to Jerusalem. His route lay across the Mount of Olives. His friends were paying him royal tribute, in the midst of which there burst upon his view the city of Jerusalem, a city of Divine possibilities, yet devastated by perverted will. Sorrow filled his great heart and blinded his eyes with tears. "And when * * * he saw the city he wept over it." A few days later he gave vent to his feelings in a similar outburst crying: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate." With the utmost tenderness Jesus viewed the world lying in sin. Bearing upon his heart the burden that sin brought upon the world He gave Himself to the Father's saving work. And how was He straitened till it should be accomplished!

But in what sense did Jesus consider Himself the Saviour of sinners? The most familiar view of salvation is that it is a deliverance from the consequences of sin. The all-important question has been: What is required that we may escape the temporal and eternal punishment that we deserve by the righteous judgment of God? and the answer has been that a mediator must be sought who is able to sustain the burden of God's eternal wrath against sin. According to this view Jesus is the Saviour because by virtue of His Godhead he bore all the punishment of all the sins of all men. "Jesus paid it all." Other views have been held since this doctrine was formulated but none has become so much a part of the common thinking of Christendom as this doctrine has.

We have been unable to discover this idea of salvation in the sayings of Jesus. As a matter of fact we know that salvation does not save a man from the consequences of his sins. The cry of the Psalmist many a penitent has repeated: "My sin is ever before me." The salvation of Jesus is deeper than

this. Jesus saves, not from the results of sin primarily, but from sin itself. "He shall save his people from their *sins*" is the prophecy bound up in the name of Jesus. This is what Jesus Himself said when He instituted the Lord's Supper: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto *remission of sins*." It is a work of *correction* that Jesus came to do. He came to set men right. "I came that they may have *life*, and may have it abundantly," he said. The religion of Jesus is the religion of a good life. "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." It is thus that the destiny of man and the race is bound up in the person of Jesus. The supreme need is for a power that shall lift man "up and out of his lower self into his higher, truer, nobler self, until he shall be no longer a son of the animal, but in very truth a son of God."* Jesus is the Saviour of *sinners*. He was convinced that in Him the all-sufficient power was at hand: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." It has been said: "From the beginning man has conceived of power, an illimitable moral and spiritual dynamic, as the most glorious of possibilities; and the history of religion is the history of these yearnings for that heavenly gift." What prophets and kings desired to see and saw not, and to hear and heard not, Jesus declared it was the privilege of his day and generation to behold. The desire of all nations was at hand in Him. A power had come into the world that was able not merely to say: "Stretch forth thy hand," and the palsied obeyed; but more wonderful still to say: "Go and sin no more," and they that were dead in trespasses and in sins obeyed, so that the scum of society became the light of the world. In Jesus Christ a power has gripped men that makes them conquerors and more than conquerors, a power that "can stay the plague of passion that eats out the heart of life;—break the fetters of pernicious

* "The Theology of an Evolutionist—Redemption," Lyman Abbott.

habit and grant a liberty that is like a resurrection from the dead;—change the motives, not of an individual alone, but of an entire community, eradicating old vices of hatred and selfishness, implanting sweet desires of charity and holiness; and doing all, not with violence, but in silent gentleness like the powers of sun and air that work the miracle of growth.” It is the power of God unto salvation that has become a reality in the world in the person of Jesus Christ our Lord.

We have yet to inquire as to how this salvation is wrought. We believe that Jesus accomplished his saving work primarily as the revealer, and that His revelation is effective because it appeals to the fundamental instincts of the race. It has been said that the two primal instincts of man are to get and to beget.* That these are primal in point of time no one will dispute, but that they are primal in point of importance it does not seem possible to us that anyone can believe. The two fundamental instincts in man are not to get and to beget; they are the instincts for God and immortality.

The tendency of our times has been to minimize the importance of the belief in immortality. It is frequently said that Christianity is a religion to live by and that it is worth while being a Christian even should there be no hereafter. There is truth in such statements and time was when it was necessary to emphasize this truth as over against an unhealthy “otherworldliness.” But the statements are misleading. “Even should there be no hereafter” does not belong to the religion of Jesus Christ. It may be worth being a Christian even should there be no hereafter, but it isn’t Christian. The religion of Jesus has the promise of the life which now is *and* of that which is to come. We are saved by hope, says St. Paul, and when Jesus opened a door in heaven for men, against whom the religions of their times had fast closed it, they sprang forth as from the dead into newness of life. If it has been said that the mass of mankind to-day have no

* “Science and Immortality,” by Dr. Wm. Osler.

vital faith in the future life,* it has also been said by equally good authority that the moral condition of the churches of the times is "relatively low and nerveless,"† and that "the supreme spiritual need of the hour is a strenuous morality."‡ In a magazine editorial some time since the question was seriously discussed: Are we ashamed of immortality? The writer said that there has grown up a habit of treating all matters pertaining to life after death by way of allusion. May it not be that the low and nerveless moral condition of our Churches is due not a little to this fact? We believe that the lack of a vital faith in the future life on the part of the mass of mankind is a cause, of which the supreme need of the hour for a strenuous morality is an effect, and that for both these conditions ministers of the Gospel who are treating the subject of immortality by way of allusion as if they were ashamed of it, must bear a large share of blame.

Jesus brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. There was no uncertainty in his mind concerning the future. Upon this subject as upon others he spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes. The future was as real to him as the present, and for the joy that was set before him he endured the cross and despised the shame. While, therefore, it is true that Jesus did not dwell especially upon the future life in his teachings, his own life was a living witness of its power; and the writings of the New Testament throughout show that in those days the hope set before men was a mighty power making for righteousness. We believe that if a minister will preach as a dying man to dying men the gospel of immortality, men will listen and in the light of their glorious destiny they will try to become the men they are not but ought to be.

But above all, Jesus revealed God to men. To Jesus God was real, "the first and most practical of realities." The

* Dr. Osler.

† Professor Ladd.

‡ Rev. R. J. Campbell.

most fundamental thing in the life of Jesus was his consciousness of God. When he spake of God he spake that he knew and testified that he had seen. He sought to bring men to God, to bring God to men, to reproduce in them his own consciousness, and when he succeeded men endured as seeing Him who is invisible.

But the transforming power of the revelation that Jesus made of God lay in the *character* of the God that he revealed. This was seen not only in what Jesus said but also in what he did and in what he himself was. The whole life of Jesus from beginning to end was a revelation of the *Father*. There was no point at which he could not have replied as he did to the request of Philip, "Show us the Father," when he said: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "To read 'that sweet story of old' is to put our hand on the heart of God; it is to know the Father." Jesus loved men even unto death. He counted not his own life as dear unto himself that he might finish the work the Father gave him to do. He laid down his life. He saved others, himself he could not save. He could not because he would not. But in that day a fountain was opened in the house of David for sin and uncleanness for all generations of men. It has been well said that there was no other way save death great enough to express the love of Christ for men. It is equally true that there was no other way save his death great enough to express the love of God for men. The death of Jesus was the supreme revelation of the love of the Father, "whereby to melt the stony heart of human selfishness, and to set its affections on things above."

Dr. Jackson, in his "The Teaching of Jesus" uses very effectively as an illustration of the propulsive power of the Father's love, the story of Lachlan Campbell and his wayward daughter Flora. It was night and Flora was alone on the crowded streets of the great city of London. Weary in body and sick at heart, she crept into the shadow of a Church and wept. After a time she discovered there was service in the

Church and while they were singing a hymn she went in and sat down at the door. She afterwards related: "The sermon was on the Prodigal Son, but there is only one word I remember. 'You are not forgotten or cast off,' the preacher said: 'You are missed,' and then he will come back to it again, and it was always 'missed, missed, missed.' Some time he will say, 'If you had a plant, and you had taken great care of it, and it was stolen, would you not miss it?' And I will be thinking of my geraniums, and saying, 'yes' in my heart. And then he will go on. 'If a shepherd was counting his sheep, and there was one short, does he not go out to the hill and seek for it?' and I will see my father coming back with that lamb that lost its mother. My heart was melting within me, but he will still be pleading. 'If a father had a child, and she left her home and lost herself in the wicked city she will still be remembered in the old house, and her chair will be there,' and I will be seeing my father all alone with the Bible before him, and the dogs will lay their heads on his knee, but there is no Flora. So I slipped out into the darkness and cried 'Father!' but I could not go back, and I knew not what to do. But this was ever in my ear, 'missed.' " And this was the word that took the lost girl back to her father and her home. It is another parable of the True Father. Oh, how God misses his lost sons! They are lost to Him. Man was made for God, and not only is it true that man cannot rest until he rests in God, but it is also true that God cannot rest until He rests in man. God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Here is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His son to be the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world. We love because He first loved us.

When I survey the wondrous cross,
On which the Prince of Glory died;
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were a present far too small;
Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

V.

EXPERIMENTAL RELIGION.

REV. CHARLES E. SCHAEFFER.

Everything in this modern day is being brought under the searchlight of scientific investigation. The scientific method, which has become the accepted method of all diligent inquiries into the truth, has wrought revolutionary results in many departments of thought and life. It has furnished us with a new world view, and has opened vistas of truth in hitherto undiscovered lands. The methods of scientific inquiry have long since been applied to the more external forms and aspects of revelation. Historical records have been examined and studied in the same careful, scientific way in which the scientist studies plant or animal life. The Bible, in consequence, has become a new volume to many. The history of Christianity has assumed new proportions and deeper significance since its study is being pursued in the spirit and under the guidance of the scientific method. In these later days this same scientific method has come to be applied in the study of the religious life itself. Men are scientifically investigating the phenomena of religion as these appear in individual lives. One who but occasionally dips into theological literature will not fail to recognize the great stress which is being placed by modern writers upon the significance of the personal element in religion. The dominant note in present day theology seems to be, away from the philosophical and purely speculative, away from the creeds and dogmas of the past, and is tending toward a renewed emphasis upon the ethical, the practical, the empirical. One finds himself surrounded by a mass of literature conveying this very fact. We have, for example, that monumental work of the late French Theologian, Augusté Sabatier: "The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the

Spirit"; also that little volume by Edward Mortimer Chapman: "The Dynamic of Christianity, a Study of the Vital and Permanent Element in the Christian Religion." We have those numerous works which bear upon the essence of Christianity. And then we have that whole fertile field which is being traversed by the new psychologists, who have already contributed so much to a clearer and truer understanding of the essence of religion. In this department, besides many others, we have the work of Professor William James on "The Varieties of Christian Experience" which is really an epoch-making volume; also the work of Professor E. D. Starbuck, "The Psychology of Religion," which has an extensive reading and wide appreciation. The Ritschlian school of theology has gone so far as to exile philosophy altogether from the realm of religious truth, and we are confronted by this whole present day revolt against the dogmatic and purely speculative aspect of religion which started with Schleiermacher in the early part of the last century, blossomed in the school of Ritschl and his immediate followers, and is bearing fruit in numerous theological volumes on both sides of the sea.

In this paper on experimental religion we do not purpose to trace the steps nor indicate the varieties of experience in religion. We simply wish to study the relation which this phase of religion bears to our modern thought and life.

Within comparatively recent years in some religious circles, when the term experience was associated with religion, it was looked upon with a degree of suspicion and not infrequently frowned out of court. The term at once suggested the extraordinary, the abnormal in the religious life. It was connected with the exaggerated, the extravagant forms of religious life. It stood for a type of religion which was in a measure obnoxious to those who happened to be reared under another system. Persons having had phenomenal religious experiences were frequently regarded either as possessing disordered nervous temperaments, or as the subjects of sentimental habits or of exaggerated self esteem. Even Prof. James, not unin-

tentionally, as he himself intimates, presents in his book the eccentricities rather than the normal and healthy varieties of religious experience. But no law is ever justly or adequately exemplified and illustrated by selecting the extravagant forms of its manifestation. There is a true, well balanced, normal, healthy experience which belongs to the very soul of religion, an experience indeed which is real and vital but which need not necessarily be accompanied by spasms of pain and excitement. Its genuine, wholesome appearance belongs to the very heart of religion, and this is what modern students of religion are recognizing and proclaiming.

Now in the light of our modern conception of religion it sounds almost pleonastic to speak of experimental religion, as if there could be religion without experiencing it. But religion was not always regarded as it is in our day. Its history shows us that men have held different conceptions of its real essence. What is religion? In what does it consist? What is its soul, its constituent elements? Its etymology will not help us very much for one may possess the name without possessing the thing itself. Its name is of purely pagan origin. Its name did not originate among those who were the recognized religious peoples of the world, the Hebrews, the Hindus, the Buddhists. The word religion comes from pagan Rome; it is of Latin origin and it has come down through the centuries colored by the principle of the Roman. The Roman imported his spirit into his religion. The spirit of the Roman is law, government, external organization. Religion thus naturally took upon itself the elements of its environment, and came to be regarded as an external relation, an external order, an institution, a formulated system. A man was supposed to be religious when he stood in proper ecclesiastical relations, when he intellectually subscribed to certain formulated dogmas. It was not regarded as a vital matter of the soul, but as an external ornament, a mechanical relation. "In the second century already," observes a recent writer on the subject, "the Christian body grew inwardly cold

while it increased outwardly in numbers and influence. Little by little for heart faith there was substituted the rule of faith." This marked the rise of the Roman Catholic type of religion. It developed an external form, a splendid outward organization, a formidable system of authority, but it failed to touch the inner springs of life and character. There were, however, some high, gifted souls who lived near heaven, in whom the true religion took refuge and maintained itself in their inner life and consciousness. Like in the barren desert there are springs of water here and there which gush forth in life and beauty, so in the barren soil of ecclesiasticism there were found those who lived near to God and knew the value of religion by their own inner moral experience. There were the pietists, the disciples of Spener, Wesley, and the Moravian Brethren, who fed upon the spiritual food of the Word, and became the precursors of the modern movement in theology. (See Sabbatier's "*Religions of Authority*," pp. 204 et. sq.)

There are thus two principal types of religion. There is the religion of authority which in Roman circles centers around a great institution with its external organization centering in the Pope as the visible head of the Church. All religious life is measured and determined by strict adherence to this external standard. In Protestant circles the religion centers around an infallible Book, instead of an infallible Pope, but it is still a religion of authority, of external authority. It accepts dogmas and creeds and formulæ of faith and makes subscription to these the basis of true religion. The Reformers evidently did not intend that this should be so, but their followers have unwittingly fallen into this ecclesiastical current which was well nigh irresistible. But now in contradistinction to these phases of external and ecclesiastical religion there is what we choose to denominate experimental religion, or the religion of the spirit, as Sabbatier prefers to call it.

Religion as viewed under this conception is a matter of the inner life and consciousness. A man can have only so much

religion as he actually experiences in his own life. It is a part of his very being. It is a matter of feeling and of conduct rather than of belief in the sense of subscribing to a dogma. It is faith, not in its ecclesiastical significance but in the sense of hearty trust and implicit confidence.

Now this type of religion is undoubtedly that of Jesus Christ and of His apostles. Jesus was no dogmatician. He did not insist on the acceptance of any dogma or creed, nor on the observance of any external rite or ceremony. Religion with Him was solely a matter of the heart, of the inner life and consciousness, a thing to be felt, to be lived, to be experienced. In the whole sermon on the Mount stress is constantly laid on the ethical and practical to the almost entire exclusion of the theoretical and doctrinal. When His remarkable discourse was completed the multitudes were astonished for He taught as one having authority and not as the Scribes. The Scribes spoke by authority, an authority which was conferred upon them in an external manner; there was no life there, religion with them lingered in the outer court and failed to penetrate into the inner sanctuary of their own life and experience. But when Jesus spake, the people at once recognized a new voice; it came from the depths of His own spiritual consciousness and it carried conviction with it. He first experienced truth in His own life and made a similar experience in others the condition of a similar possession. Sabbatier somewhere says: "In the last analysis and to go down to the very root of the Christian religion, to be a Christian is not to acquire a notion of God, or even an abstract doctrine of His paternal love; it is to live over, within ourselves the inner spiritual life of Christ, and by union of our heart with His to *feel* in ourselves the presence of a Father, and the reality of our filial relation to Him just as Christ felt in himself the Father's presence and His filial relation to Him." A clearer and truer definition of a Christian it is difficult to find. As one goes through the New Testament he will constantly meet with the same idea. "Master, where dwellest thou?" "Come and

see" says Christ. "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Asks Nathanael. "Come and see," was the reply of Philip. It was an invitation to personal investigation and experience. If Philip by the process of reasoning and argument could have persuaded Nathanael that something good did actually come out of Nazareth, Nathanael, after all, would have had but a superficial knowledge of the fact, but when he came and saw for himself, there was no argument, no persuasion sufficiently strong to convince him to the contrary. The Samaritans said to the woman: "Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world." It was experimental knowledge. You will notice how frequently the Apostle Paul uses the word to know, to know thoroughly. "We know" says he, "that to them that love God all things must work together for good." Paul did not acquire that knowledge from books, it was not intellectual knowledge, it was knowledge gained from experience. "I have learned by experience" said Laban to Jacob. This is ever the basis of true knowledge. Jesus knows the Father. But that knowledge was not obtained by reasoning, it was purely experimental, a personal entering into the life and consciousness of God.

Experience is the ultimate test of the truth. The ordinary religious believer, barring experience, has his religion made for him by others. It has been communicated to him by tradition more or less remote; he is dealing in second hand religion. He is resting on hearsay evidence. It will not require much to disturb his faith which is of such a superficial character. Religion which is fostered by experience is invulnerable to criticism. It can stand any and every assault. Here is your God, for example. If you have formed your own personal creed about Him, if you have lived in close, sweet, loving fellowship and communion with Him, then there is no argument in the world that can persuade you that there is no God. If your knowledge of God is based solely

upon logical conclusions of the reasoning faculty, then a parallel array of logical arguments may possibly shake your belief in God. But if your faith is the outgrowth of experience you can exclaim with Paul: "I know whom I have believed." So take Christ or the Bible. Let the critics come and level their guns and ply their dissecting knives; you can triumphantly exclaim: "We are persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

D'Aubigne, the celebrated church historian, tells us that when he was a student at Geneva one of his professors was expounding the Epistle to the Romans and pointing with his finger to the fifth chapter spoke on original sin. "Yes," said D'Aubigne, "I see clearly that original sin is proclaimed in the Scriptures." "But," said his professor, "do you see it in your own heart?" "That suggestion," says D'Aubigne, "was the thunderbolt which sent me to the foot of the cross."

There was once a learned judge who was an unbeliever. But out of respect for a friend who was a minister of the Gospel he allowed himself to be persuaded to attend a religious service. The minister prepared a very able, learned, logical discourse which was intended to carry conviction. During its preparation and delivery fear laid hold on the minister lest some over enthusiastic parishioner might arise to testify and spoil the effect of the sermon. At the close of the sermon an old man arose in the rear of the audience and in broken utterances spoke of the love of God in his own life and of the joy which such blessed fellowship produced. The preacher went home. A few days after a messenger summoned him to the house of the judge. As he entered he found the judge on his knees in prayer. "Ah," said the minister, "I thought my sermon would do you good!" "No," replied the judge, "your sermon was as cold and lifeless as an iceberg; it chilled my soul, but when that poor man rose and told of the love of

God and the joy of His religion in his own life, that melted my heart." Is it not right here that the ministry sometimes fails, and that sermons are still-born because they are not conceived and begotten in the depths of personal life and experience?

In thus emphasizing and pleading for the experimental in religion we would not wholly disregard the theoretical and the dogmatic. There is a necessary and legitimate place for the creed. Let us not talk flippantly of these things. But the creed, the institution, the organization, must be subordinate to the experience. These must spring from experience. Experience is ever primary and fundamental. When Peter said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," there Christian theology had its birth. It was the first clear, definite statement of faith. But that was the expression of a deep experience in the life of the disciples. They had lived with Jesus and came to know Him in their daily contact with Him. Others confessed Jesus to be only a prophet because of their superficial and fragmentary experience of Him. Experience lies at the basis of every true creed. No creed, however clearly formulated, will long remain unless it springs from personal experience. And as long as it is lived and experienced, so long will it be believed no matter what may be interposed to the contrary. But just as soon as it drops out of experience and ceases to be lived, then it can no longer hold sway over men and will eventually drop out of sight and no external authority or legislation or decree can make it effective.

As was intimated at the outstart, this phase of religion is the outcome of the modern scientific spirit. Science always makes its appeal to experience. It is "the transformation of probable knowledge into real knowledge by means of experiment." Much is to be expected from a scientific study of religion. Many and far-reaching are the beneficent results accruing therefrom. It will unfold and enhance the true meaning of religion itself. It will present it to the world as a very real thing, a part of the very life of a people, the

warp and woof of their beings. It will present it as something not to be taken up and laid aside like a garment, but as an essential, constant, abiding element in life, something not confined to Sunday and places of worship, but penetrating, permeating, pervading every avenue and vocation in life, and making every man aflame with the living God.

VI.

THE PASTOR IN RELATION TO THE CIVIC LIFE OF THE COMMUNITY.*

REV. HENRY H. APPLE, A.M.

Every age in the history of the world has had its own problems to solve. No two of these have been precisely alike. Varying conditions and attendant circumstances have served to make them different in form if not in principle. In the developing process of the human race successive stages have presented phases of life and activity that demand new thought. This age claims attention preëminently to the social question. It is revealed in business and pleasure, in public and private life. The problem has come to be of vital importance to the Christian ministry in opening a sphere of wide influence. It is pertinent therefore to present some thoughts concerning the pastor in relation to the civic life of the community. In doing so it is not desired to place restriction upon the use of words to their specific meaning but to treat the subject in a broad and general sense. The word pastor is taken to designate the minister of the Christian church, not in the one capacity of special activity, but in all functions of that ministry. Civic life is not used in the narrow sense alone of state or national duties, but as all phases of life, physical, mental, moral and religious, as well as family, social, industrial, political and ecclesiastical. Nor is it meant to overlook or underestimate the special work of a minister to the church and the agency which the church becomes as we go beyond these to examine the influence he is to exert upon the life and development of the community.

* Read at a conference at the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., March 31, 1905.

The question is, what is the relation of the minister, if any, to the life of the community in which he may be located, and what responsibility and duty does it involve? To answer that it is necessary to ask a prior question, does the Christian church, of which he is a minister, sustain any relation to the community as such, or does the Gospel of which he is a messenger have any essential connection with the general life in distinction from that of the individual. To ask it for information or to desire a demonstration of such a proposition is needless. It is accepted as a truth already and completely established and victoriously confirmed by history. It will be profitable, however, to reflect upon it and note the responsibility which commands attention to those who are now engaged in as well as those who will soon enter upon the active ministry.

The ministry of Jesus Christ was to a large extent a personal one. He discovered the individual. It was very evident that he appreciated the dignity and value and destiny of the human soul. He came to seek and to save human souls. His message of salvation was addressed to the individual. He called his disciples one by one. Two fishermen on the sea of Galilee were casting the net, a voice at their side said, "Come ye after me and I will make you to become fishers of men." A publican sat at the receipt of custom, Jesus addressed him and said, "Follow me." Passing through Samaria he stops at Jacob's well at Sychar and engaging in conversation with a woman of Samaria makes her his follower. He talks with a noted Jewish scholar and through the interview by night draws him to his following. From all classes and out of all conditions of life, those who were looking and praying for a Messiah and those who were contented with the things of earth, those who were grievous sinners and those striving for virtue and truth, he summoned and challenged individuals by what he was, by what he said and by what he did, to become his disciples. Like a good shepherd he would go after one sheep in its danger until

he would find it and bring it back on his shoulder rejoicing. In doing this he differed from the ages preceding when human life counted for little. Ancient philosophers are summed up in the "Republic" of Plato which makes the state everything and the individual nothing. Messages to the individual are rare if at all found in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. So he trained his disciples in turn that they should seek and save individuals. As they went out they were to call men unto repentance. They were to seek and save the lost; "as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." That was his instruction to them. In accord with that principle they preached and labored in the Holy Land, warning men to flee from the wrath to come, reasoning and laboring with them, watching over the growth of their characters. They insisted upon the fact that it was a personal matter with each individual to seek salvation. And one by one they were baptized into Christ.

But there is another phase of the ministry of Jesus Christ no less important and significant. Christ had a message to the community as well as to the individual. Though he discovered the individual and taught the world the value of the soul, his preaching and work were not directed exclusively to individuals. There was a public and civic side to it. The individual was the central fact but his religion was not simply for individual salvation but to establish the Kingdom of God. In this kingdom his preaching recognized the social element. The Kingdom of God is more than a collection of individuals. His Gospel was for the advancement of righteousness and the lessening of sin in the world. Sin is not only lodged in the heart of the individual but embodied in evil customs, perverted relations, harmful conditions and unjust laws for which the community is responsible. Hence the seed to be planted in the heart was also to be lodged in the soil of the community. It was not of individuals alone that Jesus was thinking when he wept over the Holy City and cried, "O! Jerusalem, Jerusalem!" or when he said, "woe unto thee, Chorazin," "woe

unto thee, Bethsaida." His Gospel was a principle to determine the progress and development of the genetic life of the world. He aimed for advance in material, intellectual and spiritual features of civilization and social life. In this aspect of his work the unit was the city of Jerusalem, the Jewish state, the Kingdom of God. In this he was fulfilling the ministry of the prophets under the Old Testament dispensation. Theirs can hardly be said to have been a personal ministry at all. They did not primarily seek out individuals. They were called like Samuel to be reformers of an evil age. It is true they did frequently address themselves to the heads and representatives of the people, kings and priests, but it was because the power to effect a change in the condition of the country rested in their hands. After the same manner Jesus sent his disciples to preach the Kingdom of God. The Gospel was to be a determinate law of progress which in asserting itself would move upward. Society was to reach a goal. Even the state was to be an element of the Kingdom of God. To this end Christian disciples were to be the light of the world, the salt of the earth, leaven for the mass of the world to attain collective progress.

These two phases of his ministry are not antagonistic. We must bear in mind that communal development depends upon the renewal of the individual. Nothing can be permanent in progress which is not under the rule of a religion that includes morality. There is no real advance in society which does not begin with the regeneration of the individual soul. Unless men as personal beings are under the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus there is no health for mankind. "There is no genuine collectivism without individualization. The lack of adequate endeavor to determine the world's career is due to the distorted views of the divine commission which are prevalent in the Churches."*

Christ's emphasis of individual worth did much to usher in

* President C. D. Hartranft, D.D., LL.D., Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

a new era for humanity. It elevated and gave dignity to human life, it inspired human effort, it asserted human worth. It is responsible for the fact that the message of modern times is addressed largely to the individual. The unit in our minds is always the soul. This is an important and essential activity of the ministry and the stress of Christian preaching. The Christian preacher is not worthy of the name who does not know what it is to hunger and thirst for the salvation of individuals and who does not esteem the salvation of even one soul well worth the labor of a life-time. Hence we estimate our success by the number of individuals brought into the Kingdom of God as the disciples did on the Day of Pentecost, and when they healed the man lame from his mother's womb at the gate of the temple, three thousand and five thousand being joined unto them.

But the ministry to the community should be no less inspiring and is none the less essential. In fact the conditions for the salvation or loss of the individual soul are found in the community. The chances of the soul are not the same, whether it lives among those who watch carefully over its development and guide its footsteps, as among those whose word and example are encouragements to every kind of sin and vice. The moral atmosphere may be such as to nourish or poison life. Conditions may sweeten the soul by goodness and holiness or plunge it into elements of vice and crime and temptation. The environment of the individual may be favorable to goodness, the evil tendencies being restrained, and an encouragement to do well. It may be so evil that vices are easily contracted and every step in the right direction meets with a storm of opposition. Society ought to nurture the soul into health and beauty and shield it from poisoning influences. For the Christian minister whose vocation it is to watch over the mental and moral and spiritual development of his fellow men, to be indifferent to the conditions by which life is surrounded is as discreditable and reprehensible as it would be for physicians of a city swept year by year by pesti-

lence to take no interest in the insanitary conditions to which the epidemic was due, and lazily content themselves with curing their own individual patients.

The civilization of the world has risen or fallen in the degree that the Gospel has been not simply light for the individual soul but leaven for humanity. Our social progress is a Christian evolution. The civilized lands, the political powers that rule the mind and energy of the world are the nations which are the undoubted fruits of apostolic labor. The best in the world is what it is by reason of the energy of the Church and her ability to herald abroad the principle of the life of Jesus Christ and cause it to permeate all life, to form a new humanity, to reach out and influence and transform human life everywhere. The Church is not only one of the great institutions of the world in its own place, but must by its very nature give color to all else, family, business, politics, literature and amusements; not to occupy a respectable place apart but to leaven life through and through.

The need of this is apparent to one who makes an analysis of society. Vice flourishes side by side with religion. We build the school house and the church and beside them is opened the public house of depravity with all the degrading vices. The Christian community has power to control the situation but allows it with all its horrors. Faster even than the victims can be saved new ones are ruined. The laws of morality and purity are treated as though they did not exist. Nations are baptized in the name of Christ but heathenism still has control of much of their life. Everywhere in the world can be seen abnormal relationships, difficulties with which men are struggling. Social wrongs are on all sides. Nations are downtrodden and oppressed by those greater in resources and might. Classes of society are ignored and denied the privileges and rights of their relative positions. Individual rights are trampled upon and taken away. The poor contend against the rich, the laborer fights his employer, the governed endeavor to overthrow law and authority. The

masses generally in their different spheres and conditions of life are struggling and toiling in dissatisfaction, discord and unrest to attain a different status of life. Whether it is attributed to the presence and power of sin or equally to the faulty judgment and misdirected efforts of man, the condition of society presents many questions for solution. The solving of these is the divinely ordained office of the Christian Church as it develops and extends its life in the world, making the kingdom come by announcing and enforcing the mind and will of God.

The forces of Christianity develop the civic life of the community through the various channels in which that life is manifested. Reference to one will do for an illustration of all. Let us take the moral institution of the family. The Christian religion solves the problem of the family which is the foundation of humanity. If life here at its source is pure its pathway in the world will be pure. When the Gospel teaching in the relation of husband to wife, parent to children and brother to sister is recognized and lived, many evils that now stain the world's life will be overcome. Here is a genuine physical foundation of society and the sphere of a rational and religious development. The home has in its bosom the germ of all things individual and communal. Here are the beginnings of the training of mind and heart and will. The quality of the household produces the tone and gives character to the material which strengthens or weakens communities. It constitutes the very choicest relationships for parents and children, sisters and brothers who are physically and spiritually united. Out of this grows the conception of human brotherhood and the family of God. The word of God heard and kept in the family is a leaven of wonderful power in a community. In like manner it will be found that through the Gospel will come deeper thought and purer life in all occupations and higher agencies of culture, art, morality and religion. It invades law, customs and institutions.

Since the Church of which he is a minister and the Gospel

of which he is a messenger sustain such a vital relation to the community, what must be the attitude of the individual pastor to the civic life in the performance of his ministry? This is an exceedingly practical and important question since it concerns not simply himself but the people of his Church whom he leads. The mind and conscience of the Church must be awake to this duty. It cannot be said that the Church has not faced the problem and is not endeavoring to lift out of the way the great obstacles which are keeping back the Kingdom of God. This does not undervalue the work of saving individual souls. But the social question is the question which the Christianity of the present day has to solve. By no means does this convert the pulpit to be the organ of secular discussion nor make the minister the mouthpiece of a party. Tact and discretion are needed at every step. Nor is he to primarily intervene in special questions. But rather is the minister to beget public spirit to discharge the duties of social and civil life as a part of Christianity and to create a concern for the public welfare, a responsibility for the state and conditions of society. The life-giving waters, said Daniel Webster, have never sprung up save in the track of the Christian ministry. Law, education, science, philosophy, charity and benevolence, all from the standpoint of the world have tried and failed. New weapons are needed. New hearts are essential. The Christian conscience must be aroused to summon forth the resources of Christian virtue.

There are three things, stated briefly, which must characterize the attitude of a pastor to the civic life of the community.

1. The Christian minister must be a student of the community in which he lives. He must be able to dissect and analyze the body corporate. A superficial view is not sufficient. He cannot depend wholly on some one else's observation and investigation but must make it himself. He must be able to distinguish the good from the bad. He must know not only the various classes and conditions of society, rich

and poor, employer and employe, thrifty and idle, educated and ignorant, religious and worldly, Christian and unbeliever, but the attitude of one to the other. To be able to distinguish the chaff from the wheat there must be a searching out of the moral and religious conditions of the people to the very bottom to see how they stand in the eyes of God. The minister must study life deeply to find the causes of what appears on the surface. For instance, here is a community in which drunkenness is prevalent. The minister must not be content to ask, do men drink and to what extent, but why do they drink? Seeking information he learns that excessively prolonged labor exhausts the system and men crave an artificial stimulus. Or perhaps he finds that low wages and no chance to rise begets a spirit of recklessness and they seek the gleam of sunshine promised to their monotonous lot. Or again, it may be evident that ill-furnished houses, poorly cooked meals, insanitary surroundings together with a strong social instinct drives them to the saloon. His task then is to stop the cause of this social misery. So, too, under immorality, dishonesty, vice and crime there are causes which must be sought out and studied. The prevalent sins are symptoms of the disease. The germ must be found before it can be destroyed and in place of it planted the seed which is the germ of a new life. In like manner he must trace the underlying forces and influences that tend to make the community better and happier. If he is to keep guard over the safety of social life he must know the condition within and the influences to which there is exposure from without to be able to give the alarm in time of danger.

2. The Christian minister must denounce what is sinful and wrong. This is emphasized because there is needed courage sometimes to do it. The man who exposes and condemns sin is not popular. Prophets in the Old Testament times braved the enmity and wrath of rulers when denouncing sin and iniquity. John the Baptist lost his life because of it. Christ suffered for it and His disciples brought upon them-

selves the hatred of the world. The Christian minister can do no less. There is a possibility, too, that the minister may unconsciously descend to the standard of judgment and life of the community instead of raising its judgment. No one can less afford to overlook, connive at or disregard sin and evil than the Christian minister. In doing it his power slips away. Truth is always truth and wrong is always wrong. There can be no compromise. There is such a thing as the sin, wickedness and iniquity of a community to be condemned. "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." The minister must take his stand against it; he cannot do otherwise. His understanding is keener than all others of the far-reaching influence of sin and evil causes and their destructive power. Evil is to be exposed and evil doers unmasked to the righteous condemnation of God. God is a righteous God and public sin calls down wrath from heaven. Like Christ, the Ambassador of the Kingdom of God pronounces judgment upon those who like Chorazin and Bethsaida and Capernaum continue in evil course, to whom it shall be less tolerable in the day of judgment than Tyre and Sidon.

3. There is a third relation without which the other two are worthless. He must bring and offer a remedy. It is found in the power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. "For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through Him might be saved." God's love is more powerful in its effect upon the sinner than his anger or condemnation. To bring healing is better than to simply expose the sore. To reveal degraded and perverted conditions of sinful life without offering a power to make them better tends to make them more horrible, to dishearten and to discourage. No condition is so low and demoralized and sinful that it does not show response to the healing power of the Gospel. Men and women, though steeped in sin, yet hunger and thirst after righteousness, communities yearn for the leaven to make them better and purer. And in their own way they are seeking

it. Secret societies, social organizations, charitable institutions, trades' leagues, reform movements of all kinds are defective attempts to reach a better state. The spirit and power of the Gospel alone can heal. When Christ fed the multitude he took the food, and gave it to the disciples and they in turn distributed it to the people as he had said, "give ye them to eat." The conception of the minister placed in a congregation, is not to cultivate scholarship, preach on Sunday, visit people during the week, to minister alone to individuals; but as a man of God living among the people in the community, by example, teaching and effort to strive to lift it up and make it better, that it may be the true reflection and real part of the Kingdom of God.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE BIBLE IN RECENT LITERATURE.

In his "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism," one of the leading English biblical scholars of our time, declared several years ago, that among those who had thoroughly studied the Scriptures from a modern point of view, the period of negation and destruction was past, and that the work of gentle and gradual reconstruction had been fairly begun. The soundness of this judgment has since then been confirmed. A considerable body of literature on the subject, the product of men equipped with competent scholarship, has been published, and its value in the service of religion widely recognized. These authors frankly accept the proved results of the scientific method of investigation as applied to the study of the Bible, and show that this can be done in a spirit of reverent appreciation of it as the record of the historic process of Divine Revelation, and with a deep desire to forward the interests of the Christian Church. They dismiss the crude dogma of an infallible verbal inspiration, invented by men in an age of controversy, but they enrich the moral and religious significance of the Sacred Book, and disclose the secret of its commanding and saving power. They cast aside the untenable theory of absolute inerrancy, depriving in this way the bitter assailants of the faith, of one of the principal weapons with which they carry on their iconoclastic attacks on the Gospels, and affording to distressed believers genuine and satisfying explanations of scriptural flaws and imperfections.

Among British writers of this class the names of Robert F. Horton and Marcus Dods are deservedly celebrated. Wherever the English language is used readers of their books have for a long while been confessing themselves largely indebted to them for new light and inspiration, both of which they bestow with rare courage, lucidity and power. In their recently published volumes on the Bible,* this is anew impressed on the reader's mind by every chapter, if not by every page of what they have here written.

Dr. Horton's aim in the present instance is not the vindication of the methods and results of modern study of the Bible—that he has attended to in his earlier books on "Inspiration and the Bible," and "Revelation and the Bible"—but to show that it is only by the labor and the accomplished results of modern scholarship that the definite and comprehensive view of the Bible as a call to missionary enterprise, has been made possible. He endeavors to show that so far as the missionary function of the Church is concerned, literary and historical criticism contributes to the inspiration for and the illustration of that function, rather than in any way to dim and retard it. He seeks "to bring the more modern way of handling the Scripture and the missionary cause together," and affirms that a method which robbed him of the missionary character of the Bible would rob him of Christianity itself. The Bible, as understood in the light of present-day science and research, is in his judgment, more of a missionary book than ever before. That the historical method of studying the Christian records, as compared to the doctrinal, yields larger missionary results, can be seen when the nineteenth century is set side by side with the sixteenth. "How Luther and Calvin and the other reformers, can have spent so much labor on St. Paul's epistles, and have got so much truth out of them, without observing

* "The Bible A Missionary Book," by Rev. Robert F. Horton, D.D., London, 1904. "The Bible, Its Origin and Nature," by Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh; New York, Scribners, 1905.

their missionary import, must ever be a matter of surprise" to students of their writings in our day. The author's contentions are so forcibly and successfully maintained that it is to be hoped the purpose for which they are designed may not be lost on those who misconceive and therefore in the interests of the practical effect of the critical movement, distrust and denounce it.

In the other volume now under reference, Professor Dods makes a contribution to our knowledge of the Bible much broader in scope and design than the first. Everybody knows that whatever he writes is well worth reading, and the present publication is by no means an exception. It is full of insight and information, clearly thought and clearly expressed, devout and scholarly, intellectually and spiritually alive. One should be at a loss, for instance, to suggest a book in which the reasons for assigning to the Bible the supreme place among all sacred writings, are so definitely and convincingly set forth as in the opening chapter of this volume on "The Bible and Other Sacred Books." There is here the frankest acknowledgment that the Spirit of God is not imprisoned in the Bible and that He speaks through the words and writings of all good men. "Not *all* God's word is Scripture. * * * Romanists and the Friends are right in resolutely maintaining that the Spirit is ever alive and active in imparting truth. To many the word of God has first come through the example or remonstrance of a friend or through some awakening incident in life. Far more legibly than in Scripture do we read in our own experiences some of the profoundest and most salutary lessons God has taught us." What, then, is the secret which gives to the Bible a distinctive, authoritative, and normative power and position, all its own? "It can not be too often repeated," says Dr. Dods, "that the element in the Bible which differentiates it is not the supreme and unrivalled excellence of all its constituent parts, nor that in it alone God speaks to man, but that it is the record of his supreme manifestation in Jesus Christ." That constitutes it, par excellence,

the word of God which it concerns all men to hear and obey. "It is in it we listen to what God has to say to His children on earth as a society or Church. Here we have the public, common revelation, from which all Christian institutions and all Christian hopes spring and in which all Christians can meet." Once recognize this unifying element as binding together and elevating to their supreme place the several books of the Canon, what do discrepancies, inaccuracies, or even positive mistakes in the text amount to, as the Book goes on in carrying its saving message to mankind? Christ is the central light whose illuminating rays are shed through the entire Scripture. This explains why it has the power of ministering to the best life men can know, why the highest aspirations men have ever cherished and the ripest characters they have attained, have sprung from it, and why it can bring to men courage in danger, hope in despair, comfort in sorrow, and solace in death. God's revelation to man is consummated in Jesus Christ, and the value of the Bible results from its connection with Him. "Christ is the supreme, ultimate revelation of God, and the Bible, being the amber in which He is preserved for man, is as inviolable and unique as He."

From the succeeding chapters treating of revelation, inspiration, infallibility, the trustworthiness of the Gospels, and the miraculous element contained in them, much that is illuminating and confirmatory of the constructive character of the work done by biblical scholars of to-day, as above observed, might readily be gathered. For want of space that may not be undertaken however. It must satisfy us to refer in briefest phrase to only a few of their outstanding and significant characteristics. The Divine Revelation of the Bible is progressive in its nature, accommodating itself of necessity to the capabilities of men in its advancing steps. Inspiration is the complement of revelation just as sight is the complement of the external world. When sight is imperfect, things external are not seen as they really are. When inspiration is partial only, revelation is imperfectly apprehended. In the Bible we have

the record of revelation as apprehended by various individuals, the several records bearing the marks of their differing individualities. The records are not absolutely without error. "The reluctance to admit the existence of errors in Scripture is not surprising, and is even in a sense commendable, but the man who binds up the cause of Christianity with the literal accuracy of the Bible is no friend of Christianity, for with the rejection of that theory too often comes the rejection of the Bible itself, and faith is shattered." Inerrancy in the Bible is not essential to its acceptance by the Christian. "The only possible ultimate ground for believing Scripture to be the word of God is that there is that in the truth delivered which convinces me that God is its Author." The trustworthiness of the Gospels is established by the self-authenticating power of the truth they teach. The transcendent miracle of the Gospels is inseparable from the person of Christ Himself—the perfect manhood, the ideal relation to God and man, He constantly manifested. This perfect manhood, not an external miracle, drew to Him His earliest and most devoted followers. Seeing Christ, men saw God, and saw him more and better than they had thought. Is this living, personal miracle in the realm of the spiritual word less or is it greater than the physical miracles He is said to have wrought? "Which is the more divine, the turning water into wine or the perfection of character that is impervious to sinful thought and desire? The one thing is as unexampled as the other, as truly beyond experience. It is the personality of Christ which enables some to dispense with the miracles He wrought; yes, but it is His personality, also, which makes them credible."

THE LIFE OF CHRIST STUDIED ANEW.

The interest attaching to the name of Jesus is perennially fresh and inspiring. Thomas Carlyle never spoke more truthfully than when he said in "*Sartor Resartus*" that "its significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest." The subject is one of inexhaustible

richness, as successive efforts in the study of it are constantly demonstrating. One is profoundly impressed by a sense of this fact every time the results of such study by an original and gifted mind are given to the Christian public. Recently there was one of this description visiting the churches of our land and bringing them a message from abroad which touched and thrilled the hearts of many thousands of their members hearing him. Whatever the service rendered by his personal presence and inspiring addresses, one may be allowed to venture the opinion that the service of his recently published books,* the knowledge and circulation of which amongst American readers will, no doubt, be greatly enlarged because he has been personally seen and heard, must prove immeasurably vaster and more enduring.

Dr. Dawson, immediately one sees him, leaves the impression of being a strong and original personality. Breadth of culture, clearness, simplicity and force of style, beauty and strength of diction, are at once in evidence when he begins to speak. And, what is even more important, one soon becomes conscious in following his discourse, he has a vital, penetrating insight into the Gospel and a firm hold upon the person and spirit of Christ. These rare and important qualities in such striking combination appear in the pages of his publications and lend to them peculiar charm.

In starting out to write the "Life," one observes with satisfaction, he chooses the fourfold narrative of the Evangelists as the source of his materials to the exclusion of the theology and metaphysics of the epistolary writings of the New Testament. What men need more than a theology or system of doctrine is "a human Christ, a Person who can be loved, an Example that can be followed,—One who in living the most perfect of all lives, has become the Arbiter of life itself, the mirror of all perfection, and the fountain of all grace and

* "The Life of Christ," by Rev. William J. Dawson, D.D., Philadelphia, Jacobs and Co. "The Reproach of Christ," by the same, New York, Flemming H. Revell Co.

virtue." The incomparable picture of this needed personality is drawn, with a pencil dipped in vital hues, in the Gospels, which to his mind are incontestably trustworthy so far as this portraiture is concerned. 'Twere an impertinence to regard it imaginary. "To have invented or evolved the sublime Figure of Jesus of Nazareth, the Evangelists must have been the equals of the Christ whom they invented. They were no more capable of such a task than the man destitute of genius is capable of creating the enduring masterpieces of art and literature. With a divinely artless art, which transcends all art and fills the mind with wonder, four men of diverse idiosyncrasy describe the life of Jesus in such a way that the mind of the whole world is henceforth riveted upon their pages; and the more closely these Gospels are studied the more decisive becomes the verdict of their essential truth."

With this conviction our author begins his purpose to depict the life of "the Man Christ Jesus"—Paul's phrase—only to discover, however, and that very soon, certain "elements in that life entirely incommensurate with the limits of the human,—elements, which it is not possible to disengage from the Divine." Thus for instance he comes upon the extraordinary language, by the implied claims of which his enemies were stung to madness,—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am,"—and is led to make these significant observations: "There is no accounting for such a saying as this upon any ground of human reason. It seems irreconcilable even with human sanity. He speaks of Himself as though all Eternity were His, as though His existence were co-equal with the very existence of God. Nay, He uses of himself the very symbol of the Divine existence, unspeakably sacred and awe-inspiring to the Jew. I Am, I Am—ceaseless, timeless being—not before Abraham was I was—but I Am—the untroubled, conscious, Eternal Being of Deity. Those who see in Jesus merely one who taught certain truths, more or less impregnated with human error, have to reckon with such passages as these. They are too bold and they are too

sublime to have been invented. The reason faints before them, the judgment is dazzled and confounded. Something He must have meant by them, for it was not the way of Christ to use rash, inconsiderate, and meaningless words. And we find the clue to them when we read the prologue to St. John's Gospel. He was the Word. He was God uttering Himself—He was the Eternal Thought of God interpreting itself to man—"and the Word was in God, and the Word was God." Are these not words which many in our time may well lay to heart and prayerfully ponder?

Every reader of the Gospels must notice that Jesus commanded horizons of thought and aspirations undreamed of by the Jew. How is this extraordinary development to be accounted for? Not on the ground of the fact, as Dr. Dawson thinks, of the indwelling Deity nor on that of the promptings of mere intuition. "There is almost always some process of inoculation, some tiny germ planted silently, it may seem by chance, which in due time is quickened into life. Nazareth where the silent years were passed, was situated along one of the great caravan routes from the East to Damascus. Did people travelling from the Orient drop some seeds of wider religious and ethical truth and knowledge into the receptive mind of the Carpenter's Son? Is it permissible to imagine Him, armed with the tools of His craft, wandering among the palms and temples of other countries than His own, in which religion still retained the spirit of mysticism long lost in the chilly Pharisaic formalism of Judea?" We cannot tell. But any suggestion not inherently impossible or irreverent, that may help us to comprehend His mental development, should be welcomed, and what is said in this new "Life" is at once fresh and illuminating, along these avenues of conjectural thought. The same may be said with reference to the study and exposition of the social truths insisted on by Christ in His programme for the reconstruction of the social order. If there is anything in our language better than that found here, it has not come to one's attention. And the prin-

ciples underlying this study are enforced and illustrated in a number of the discourses of the second volume, with a vigour and skill that commend them as being eminently worthy of study by those interested in the social questions confronting the Christian Church in our age. A master mind has been at work here and the practical suggestions made will afford valuable guidance to earnest workers in explaining Christ's thought and purposes, but especially in showing him as the ever-present Lover and Friend of men. Is it not correct to say, as Dr. Dawson does, that it is enough if we shall so read the story of the Man Christ Jesus that we may believe that He is God, 'not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking Manhood into God?' "There is a creed at once wiser and simpler even than the creed of Athanasius, in which Doubt itself puts on angle-wings,

"Thou seemest human and divine,
The highest, holiest manhood, Thou:
Our wills are ours, we know not how;
Our wills are ours, to make them Thine."

SOCIAL ETHICS AND PRACTICAL RELIGION.

Among the output of recent American books there are not a few which reflect the deepened interest with which men are addressing themselves to ethical questions particularly in their practical sociological relations. One* of the foremost of these is a monument to the author's patient industry, and contains a conscientious and valuable discussion of some phases of the wide field covered by these important questions. The purpose and character of his work are well set forth in the summary given by the writer: "The central thought of this treatise is that the Christian life is the highest mode of moral life of which man is capable, and is distinguished from the lower forms of ethical life by its own characteristic manifestations. But the Christian is a man; on the basis of his man-

* "The Ethics of the Christian Life, or The Science of Right Living," by Henry E. Robins, Philadelphia, Griffith and Rowland Press, 1904.

hood a nobler manhood is developed through the work of the Holy Spirit. We find the source of our knowledge of ethical facts and principles, in the first instance, in the normal constitution of man; then, in the experience of Christians; and, thirdly, in the Holy Scriptures as bringing the believer into vital relation to Christ."

The three parts of the book deal respectively with the following topics: First, the nature of the ethics of the Christian life,—the moral agent, the disorder of the moral nature, and the remedy for the moral disorder. Second, the scope of the ethics of the Christian life,—all duty, to self, to society, to nature, to God, resting on the holy will of God. Third, the methods of the ethics of the Christian life—the individual member of the Church ought to recognize his duty to employ those methods, when the Church as an organization has no duty to do so. The Church is incompetent to form a policy relating to such problems as temperance reforms, relations of capital and labor, the care of the poor, and so forth. It has not the knowledge, and it is not entrusted with the power, adequate to grapple successfully with questions of this character. It has been forcibly pointed out by a recent writer* in the *American Journal of Theology* that those relying simply on ecclesiastical effort to apply ethical principles to such important problems, must necessarily leave the most perplexing, complicated, and pressing of them practically untouched. "Christian Ethics are by no means to be confined to the duties of the Church as an organization. Action of the state must be brought under the control of right and obligation. The entire community has duties, and these duties must be discovered and framed into laws, regulations of administration, maxims of custom and sentiment." This makes room for wide individual Christian effort. Had this been recognized as it should have been by certain ones attending our last meeting of General Synod, how gratuitous much of the discussion on the question of the policy on temperance would have appeared,

* Charles R. Henderson, in Volume IX., Number 2, April, 1905, p. 387.

and how idle and ill-advised a number of the resolutions offered for adoption by the Woman's Missionary Society at the meeting held at the same time! The Church and its auxiliary organizations will be strong and efficacious just to the extent that they attend to the performance of their functions, and avoid exceeding their jurisdiction by a zeal without adequate knowledge.

THE SECRET OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

The origin of life has for a long while been one of the questions debated by naturalists on the one side, and Christians on the other. The former have sought to account for it on the basis of naturalistic evolution, that is without God, and without "resident forces" Divinely ordained and operative in matter. The latter have contended that life can proceed only from life, and in accordance with laws continuously sustained by the will of Him who is directly or indirectly the Author of all life. Two deliverances have recently appeared from representatives of these two classes, which in their contrast make interesting reading. The first is furnished by Dr. Jacques Loeb, the noted head of the biological department in the State University of California. He makes the deliberate statement, according to the newspaper prints, that his experiments have succeeded in producing life by artificially fertilizing the egg of a sea urchin. This is his report:

"We are now able to imitate the natural process of fertilization in the egg of the sea urchin completely by purely chemical and physical means. The fact that the parthenogenetic larvæ raised by the new method have the same vitality as the larvæ produced by normal fertilization arouses the hope that it will be possible to undertake the solution of the problems for which the raising of parthenogenetic larvæ in large quantities is preliminary, and successfully to enter the field of more complex organisms, so as to show the whence, the where, and the how, of actual life in the higher animals, and artificially to produce the same."

The second comes from Lord Kelvin, whose word on scientific subjects carries as much weight and authority as that of any man living, and is worth noting, therefore, by those who feel inclined at times to listen to the pratings of the constantly diminishing number of atheistic investigators of physical phenomena. Before a company of physicians he discussed particularly questions of biology, and affirmed most distinctly that materialistic claims, with reference to the origin of life, have no foundation in either fact or reason. Here are his own words:

"Let not any of your minds be dazzled by the imaginings of the daily press that because Bertholet and others have made food-stuffs, they can make living things, or that there is any prospect of a process being found in any laboratory for making a living thing, whether the minutest germ of bacteriology or anything smaller or greater. There is an absolute distinction between crystals and cells. Anything that crystallizes can be made by the chemist. Nothing approaching to the cell of a living creature has ever been made. The general result of an enormous amount of exceedingly intricate and thoroughgoing investigation by Huxley and Hooker and others of the present age, and by some of their predecessors in both the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries, is that no artificial process whatever, can make living matter out of dead. That is vastly beyond the subject of the chemical laboratory—beyond it in depth of scientific significance and in human interest."

VIII.

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY IN GERMANY.*

BY PROF. F. A. RAUCH, PH.D.
BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, OCTOBER, 1837.

I. PROBABLE CAUSE OF THE GREAT NUMBER OF CHURCH HISTORIANS.

Since the middle of the eighteenth century Germany has been favored with numerous church historians, each competing with the other for the laurels of victory. The field of Church history is wide and fertile; in its sphere are contained the highest interests of man. Its theme is eternal truth as revealed through our Saviour; it leads us through all the attempts, which man either in becoming humility has made to unfold the treasure of revealed wisdom and bring it nearer to our hearts, or by which he in his perverse pride has substituted his own opinion in the place of the glorious Spirit that breathes in every word of the blessed Gospel. It is certainly interesting to learn from the history of the world how man from a state in which he knew nothing of those arts which rest on the use of iron, of the plough and of fire—in which he fought with animals for his food and his dwelling—in which his language was but the stammering of a few inarticulate sounds—in which he wandered from place to place with no other property than his bows and arrows—rose gradually to the present state of cultivation in which the world of atoms is under his control and every sea and stream at his command, in which the products of one climate are exchanged for those

* This article was furnished in typewritten form by Rev. James I. Good, D.D. It is reprinted in order that another of the few literary remains of Dr. Rauch may be preserved in accessible form for those interested in Reformed Church history. Its intrinsic merit likewise warrants its re-publication.

of others and in which science, art and literature have reached their highest summit. But Church history exhibits a spectacle infinitely more interesting. Here it is not the desire of dominion, not the wants of our sensual life, not accidental motives that excite man to action; it is the eternal truth, it is the solution of the problem of our destination on earth and hereafter, and which none of the wisest in ancient times knew, what could never enter their history, the manifestation of that relation which man bears to his God. Each one may learn a lesson from Church history appropriate to himself, but one truth belongs to us all in common, that the spirit of our beloved religion forces its way through the darkest ages and triumphs over the most daring attempts to corrupt it; that we are all in the hand of the Lord and must serve him either with our will or against it, either as his slaves or as his children. Whatever man may intend by his actions, they must promote the great plan of our Redeemer even, then, when he with a feeling of entire security fondly expects the victorious success of evil designs. Blinded by wealth, misled by the ignorance of nations and the weakness of emperors, the Catholic priesthood changed their power over the conscience into the power of the sword, until by degrees their arrogance and sinfulness, concentrated in the popes and undauntedly inflicted on an already unwilling generation, called forth from his security a monk, who, giving the signal to rebellion, snatched from their hands one half of Europe and, in accordance with divine Providence, secured to all Protestants by the ever blessed reformation those rights which we now know how to esteem and how to protect after our forefathers once longed for them in vain.

Whilst we seek in the general interest, which Church history has for every one without exception, for the nearest cause of so many excellent works following each other in close succession, the more remote it may be found partly in the circumstance, that through the influence of neology the doctrines of the Christian religion had sunk down to merely historical

interest, and partly in the demands, which the progress of science and literature made on the Church historians. These demands are so manifold that it is beyond the power of one individual to satisfy all of them and only the united efforts of various talents elicited by the deficiencies of their predecessors may approach the ideal of historiography. For it is implanted in our nature that, though all our attempts are circumscribed, we cannot repress the ardent desire to look into infinity.

II. DEMANDS ON THE HISTORIOGRAPHER.

The object of writing a Church history must be this: we wish to represent all those doctrines and actions which have exercised a decided, incontrovertible and obvious influence on the present state of the Church. Men disappear from the scene of their life and their opinions are soon forgotten, but the aim of history is to show that they are necessary links in the chain which connects the most distant times with the present. Yet dependent on the riches or poverty of sources there may be many flaws in this chain and, although all ecclesiastical changes have proceeded the one from the other like a stream, we meet with instances where but a wave of this stream is yet visible. Nevertheless this internal connection of all opinions and actions is the great end of history; and the historian's first principle must be to render this systematic harmony manifest which to the superficial reader is drowned by the great number of apparently accidental and disconnected facts. That, however, which connects all of them and makes of infinitely many external deeds one internal whole, is in Church history the eternal truth, which as their common exciting cause and turning point, either directly or indirectly, manifests itself through all opinions and actions even if they be gross errors. To effect this manifestation of the truth in his representation, the historian must carefully separate that which has proceeded from the peculiar power of the Christian religion from that which either the individuality of persons or principles foreign to the Christian spirit has added.

III. PROPER USE OF SOURCES.

From this brief allusion it will briefly appear that a mere investigation of historical data will not suffice, though it may require great learning and much acuteness to establish those which are correct and refute those which are erroneous. For it is not on account of themselves that these data are desirable, but on account of the actions related by them. Every action, however, expressed by word or deed is what it is only by its design. This design is the soul constituting its moral worth. The historian desirous of attaining historical truth must ascertain not only the action but its design too; otherwise he has a phenomenon without understanding it. It is only when he succeeds in divining this design that it is history; else it is merely an exercise of the memory and becomes a matter of mind; it is only thus we obtain historical certainty and a faithful representation of past actions; otherwise it is a mere notice of external occurrences which, disconnected in themselves, cannot give us a correct picture of the past. Yet it is difficult to present that which is past fresh to the mind, whilst it is easy to mention mere occurrences. The historian has but data which record actions, yet the data are not the actions themselves and admit frequently of different interpretations, especially as regards the design of the actions. This difficulty is not met with in natural sciences. There the philosopher has the subject on which he treats fully before him and can investigate all its particulars, none of which can withdraw itself from observation. All he has to do is to observe accurately and describe faithfully. The Church historian, on the other hand, must represent what is past and revive, as it were by a new creation, actions and their designs, though they belong to bygone ages. Here he alone who knows how to enter into the spirit of history as a whole, will succeed in explaining each individual action.

Difficult as the critique of historical sources may be and immense the learning and judgment which it demands, infinitely more difficult is the task of divining the design

of the agent in his deeds and their connection with the whole; especially if conjectures and hypotheses are not indulged in or at least do not admit of historical certainty. How inefficient on the other hand the attempt is to explain every action by the causal nexus so that the effect of each on the other becomes the cause of the third, etc., in an uninterrupted chain, in which everything occurs according to an irresistible necessity, may be seen by a mere glance at the results of such historians as have made it. Whatever opinion a divine may have held, it is in its view to be interpreted by his education, by his early impressions or by the spirit of his age rather than by the power of truth to which his investigations were alive. Even our Saviour's doctrines, they have been daring enough to retrace to impressions received from the Essenes or the Sadducees or from a comparison of the doctrines of the Sadducees and Pharisees or to his education among Alexandrian Jews. The highest and most fertile of all causes and effects is no doubt the mind, and the more deeply we become acquainted with the spirit of Church history the more are we inclined to see in what we call causes means, and in what we call effects ends. Thus order, connection, systematic harmony and a final aim are perceptible in history; all of which we must feel unwilling to consider as the products of a mere causal nexus, which having once received an impulse to go forward like the fatal necessity of the Epicurean system passes from generation to generation, working deeds in all of them, neither designed nor understood by the agents. Thousands of facts confirm this teleological principle of political and ecclesiastical history, and, if there are some which render it doubtful, they must explain by their connection with the rest and that opinion which offers the greater satisfaction to the understanding is to be received until more light shall have produced more probability.

IV. MORAL CHARACTER OF THE HISTORIAN.

To write a history in this way great flexibility of mind is required to enter readily into the spirit of every age, the situa-

tion, the moral and religious character of every individual. But of equally great importance is the moral character of the historian. He must have freed himself by religious principles and by the aid of God from the dominion of every low passion; he must have fought that severe struggle with himself by which alone man gains the victory over his sensual nature. An envious, revengeful, haughty and ungrateful nature will not feel disposed on the one hand to acknowledge any haughtiness, revengefulness and ingratitude as vices, but rather attempt to beautify or excuse them wherever history has to represent them; and on the other hand he will be slow in acknowledging the opposite virtues but will seek for motives that, selfish in themselves, diminish the moral value of the action. Thus the Catholics have frequently asserted that Luther's motive in engaging in the ever blessed reformation was the desire to get married and that the princes protecting his cause wished to enrich themselves by the possessions of the Church.

V. PIETY OF THE HISTORIAN.

It is only when no deed recorded by history, no word attracts our attention or gains our favor on account of him who did or spoke it, but solely on account of their moral or religious tendency, that history becomes what it ought to be. But the historian, who, destitute of piety or moral principles, prefers being witty or satirical to being just, like Voltaire, never succeeds in giving us historical truth. He may be able to ask, whether the action is useful? whether the best means of realizing a plan have been employed? but the questions what is good? or what is truth? he is unable to answer—for this requires a willingness to waive all other considerations and live with heart and soul to the will of God by which alone all can have an idea of what is right or wrong. It is by the spirit of religion that we can understand its truth, and he that has not the former can neither have the latter nor impart it.

VI. VIEWS OF THE HISTORIAN ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

It is the history of the Church that is to be written; much, therefore, depends on what the historian understands by the Church. His notion of it may be considered his fundamental view upon which he raises the superstructure of his history. The different views on this point give the different works on ecclesiastical history their principal distinctive points. I deem it, therefore, expedient for my purpose to point out the prevailing ones.

The Christian Church has reality only through the Holy Ghost which, as the Spirit of Truth and love, is the principle of faith. Nothing, that does not proceed from it, is to be considered as a part of the Christian Church. Whatever, on the other hand, is penetrated by this spirit belongs to the Church of Christ. The Holy Spirit does not, therefore, exclusively acknowledge any particular sect or nation, but has selected himself a congregation out of all nations and all ages so that a person may attain salvation to whatever denomination or people he may happen to belong if he has only been regenerated by the Spirit of Truth and by the grace of God and has become a member of the invisible Church of Christ.

Nevertheless, this invisible Church has become visible by its existence on the earth. For, becoming visible, that which in itself is but one has shot forth different branches from one root accommodating itself from eternal grace and love to the difference in national and individual characters. Thus the one Church has manifested its riches and power by the formation of many denominations, all of which, however, must be united in the fundamental truths of our religion and thus be identical with each other. By this union, by basing itself upon the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, each denomination claims the title of a Christian communion. The peculiar manner, on the other hand, in which they understand particular passages of the Bible and in which they express their faith by external rites, causes the difference. When denominations acknowledge their common origin and basis,

they will love each other and maintain a brotherly connection with each other since the same spirit that unfolds its riches to our eyes by many influences unites again those differing by love and truth. But when we look more upon these points in which they differ than upon those in which they are united, the difference between them will result in opposition, each denouncing the other and each claiming the exclusive privilege of solely possessing truth and salvation and condemning all the rest as in error. This is the spirit of Catholicism and remains the same wherever this sectarian feeling is cherished by a denomination, *i. e.*, of protesting against all the Roman Catholic exclusiveness. Whilst the historian must keep aloof from such contracted and narrow views, whilst the eye of his mind must seek only for truth as manifesting itself in various forms in all of which it is still the same, just as the light is neither diminished nor changed by falling on different kinds of eyes, he needs to be no less careful lest he should fall into the opposite extreme and from a desire to be liberal should, like so many neologists, become indifferent. He must perceive a necessity for the existence of various denominations. The stream of life flowing forth from Christ is so rich that it by far exceeds the capacity of any individual or set of men either to understand or represent the whole of it. It requires, therefore, different denominations, which, like mirrors, reflecting rays from the same spiritual sun, represent in different reflexes the same truth and thus supply each the deficiency of the other. Four evangelists were necessary to write the life of Christ, each in his own peculiar manner, and if one of them were wanting the records of that life would be incomplete. So it ought likewise to be expected that for the same reason the present followers of Christ should be affected differently by the same truth according to their individual dispositions; and that, whilst each dwells particularly on that side of truth which strikes him most forcibly, all of them are necessary to give a complete idea of the whole truth. But how shall the historian be able to cherish such expansive views, if he, in-

stead of being a thorough theologian filled with the Spirit of Truth, be either a narrow-minded sectarian or infidel?

VII. STYLE OF THE HISTORIAN.

There yet remain some difficulties which, arising partly from the manner of representation, partly from the mode of arranging materials, present themselves to the careful historian. To make actions the subject of history clearly understood the historian must delineate time and place, when and where they occurred, whether their duration has been short, like the fight of David with Goliath, or long, like the march of the Israelites through the desert; whether it have been the Mediterranean on which Cæsar sailed, or the wide ocean where Columbus ploughed his ships. Without these delineations history merely relates facts in their succession and becomes a dry chronicle without imagination or spirit. If, on the other hand, the historian indulges his imagination too much, his history may easily resemble a romance. For romance, especially when written by the master hand of a Scott, borrowing its characters from history with great accuracy in describing localities and the manners and customs of different periods, may gain the appearance of historical truth. But though it is praiseworthy for a romance to approach history in its character, it is reproachful to the latter to yield its dignity and office of instructing to the imaginative beauties of poetry and the desire of entertaining.

Now, in Church history much is to be related, little to be described. Its subject is the Church and her doctrines, and, unlike that of civil history, exists less in space and time than in the mind, in the thought, in the spirit. Its object is instruction; and its art, to develop in clear and distinct language the principles and to manifest the substance of Christian doctrines by faithfully giving their history. Whilst the ecclesiastical historian must not beautify his subject nor attempt to give it any other interest than that which truth secures it, he must neither deface it by mingling his own views with, or

scattering his judgments throughout, the relation. Each period forms a necessary link of the chain which leads from remote antiquity to the present time and on its part promoted the gradual advancement to the present state of cultivation. It claims therefore the right to be judged by the spirit of its age above which it could not be expected to rise, though in its bosom the seed of a higher period was germinating. It is not only unjust but renders a correct judgment impossible, if we make the more enlightened views of the present day a standard of those of any former age, and thus, overlooking the necessity of their having once existed, endeavor to show our own wisdom by throwing ridicule and censure over them. The only way to give the reader a correct idea of former periods is to lead him into their spirit and to secure him a full insight not only into actions and their design but also into their bearing on futurity so that history may assume the form of a harmonious whole, the aim of which is to bring the truth of the Christian religion constantly nearer to us.

VIII. ARRANGEMENT.

Finally, as the relation so also the method of arranging historical materials presents difficulties which are neither small nor few. The element of history is time in its succession. Every deed has a relation both to the past and to the future, and all actions may be considered as flowing in an uninterrupted stream. At the same time, however, no deed is isolated in its own time, but is surrounded by many that are contemporaneous. Hence there are two methods of arranging the materials of history. One observes the contemporaneousness of the deeds and goes by centuries; thus the qualitative unity, which our minds strive after, is destroyed; the thread of facts, being cut off by those deeds which form one chain, are linked together. The other method directs its attention principally to that quality by which actions, being united with each other, form a whole, and divides according to the most important era in the continuance and expiration of historical

facts. Thus, however, the tie, by which many contemporaneous actions are interwoven is sundered and while a review of them is rendered almost impossible the isolated train of facts itself becomes less intelligible, since the different functions of history in their development cannot be understood without a knowledge of their contemporaneous relation to each other; for all require and determine each other mutually. Hence it is that, whilst either of the arrangements is insufficient by itself, they will, if united, produce a complete picture of history.

In casting a glance over the historiography of Germany I do not intend to enter on the particular but only on the general merits of each school. For of schools I must speak as well when adverting to historians, especially in a country where schools exercise so entire a sway as they do in Germany.

IX. ORTHODOX SCHOOL.

(a) *Sectarian Historians.*—Until the Reformation history was but a matter of memory, a mere chronicle. Without being understood or consulted for their bearing, facts were related according to the time in which they succeeded each other. With the Reformation, however, an opposition had taken place in the Church which resulted in an entire separation. The historian had from this time to exercise his judgment in reflecting on the nature of this separation, in tracing it back to its origin and principle, the truth of the gospel; and the security with which Catholic writers had formerly rested on the infallibility of the Pope and all ecclesiastical measures originated by his Holiness were lost forever. On the one hand, now we see the old Church attack Protestantism and anxious to defend her own immutability on the other, we find Protestantism ready to justify its progress and to refute the doctrines of Catholicism by the truths of the gospel. Thus Church history giving an account of this agitation becomes subservient to the interest of these two great parties and changes its hue from the very commencement down to the present time. From

the time of the Reformation to the middle of the eighteenth century, it has therefore an apologetical and polemical tendency, and if written with faithfulness, conscientiousness and true piety this kind of historiography, though deficient in many respects, may in its time be expected to do good. Exaggerations will, it is true, take place, but, as they will be found on both sides, those on the one will be rendered harmless by the other. Seckendorf's Lutheranism, 1691, may serve as an example.

(b) *More Impartial Historians.*—In the middle of the last century when the Protestant world of Europe was divided into two great portions, Arnold in the name of the pious, and Thomasius in that of the new, school with equal warmth demanded impartiality on the part of the historian. History, they asserted, ought to be a science independent of party views; the life of the Church, in whatever form it may present itself, is to be faithfully represented. Criticism is to be exercised, data must be investigated and compared with each other and every fact must be substantiated by the necessary documents. These facts are then to be connected according to their internal affinity and hence history is no longer divided into centuries but into periods. Again the composition must contain an exposition of its matter, the style must be elegant, the representation tasteful. The contents it was conceived are in themselves rather dry, but imagination and language can and ought to secure the interest of the reader. Mosheim (born 1694, d. 1755), though his history is yet divided into centuries, takes, nevertheless, the lead of this period, and his works, together with those of Buddeus, deserve the credit to have been first in turning the reader's attention to the internal spirit and doctrines of the Church.

X. HETERODOX HISTORIANS.

During the period of Mosheim, Wolf's philosophy prevailed throughout Germany. As this on its part had forced Leibnitz's metaphysics to evaporate its spirit, so the so-called

philosophy rendered Wolf's still and lifeless method of philosophizing still more shallow. Before Wolf philosophy in Germany had been the exclusive property of the learned; Leibnitz himself wrote only in Latin and French; Wolf, advised and guided by Leibnitz, composed most of his voluminous quartos in German and in simple intelligible, though stiff and methodical, style. After his philosophy had become extremely superficial the Germans turned their attention to the investigation of other nations and with them received the English Deism and the French naturalism. The time when this took place honored itself with the title of the improved and enlightened age and considered itself to be extremely wise. This self conceit was however destroyed in a most mortifying manner when Jacobi (born 1743, d. 1819), starting from Rosseau's philosophy, and Kant (born 1743, d. 1804), induced by Hume's skepticism, introduced each a system of their own.

Though these systems differ considerably and though it was Kant's Criticism particularly that upset forever all so-called natural religion, their result with regard to the Christian religion was nearly the same. According to both God is incomprehensible yet we are forced to believe in his existence. Both opposed the term revelation as used in the symbolical books of the Protestant churches. That the revelation should be inspiration, that the ideas revealed should be thoughts which God in a miraculous manner had implanted in the minds of the sacred writers, they questioned. Thoughts can only proceed from the power of thinking; how then, they asked, can divine thought in man be distinguished from his own? Or how can thoughts of God become at all those of man without proceeding from the power of thinking in the latter? Or how could man understand those thoughts without thinking them himself? And in the latter case would they not be his thoughts by whatever process he might have obtained them?—Jacoby therefore maintained that man has an innate consciousness of God with which a conviction of his existence is

connected which surpasses even the certainty of our self-consciousness. This conviction he calls faith, and its development in history he calls revelation, since that, which before was concealed, becomes daily more manifest. Kant who admitted no knowledge except it could be deduced from our own understanding and mind arrived at the conclusion that we can know nothing of God, either by revelation or by reason. Not by revelation, because unless man had an idea of God before receiving that revelation he would not be able to ascertain whether what was revealed to him was God or not, and because unless he was convinced of the existence of God before the revelation was made he would naturally doubt whether the revelation was really from God. Not by reason, for reason can only know itself and external nature but in neither can it ascertain the existence of God. We know nature only as it appears to our senses without having it ever in our power to say what it really is. God, who is a noumenon and not a phainomenon, who does not appear to our senses cannot therefore be ascertained by the knowledge of nature. Again reason being the power of all knowledge may indeed discover among many other ideas also that of an eternal and almighty being as the first cause of all, but whether this idea corresponds with the reality it must leave undecided. He therefore sought for what he could neither find in revelation, the possibility of what he did not altogether deny, nor in reason which according to him can know nothing of the supernatural, in the postulates of our moral sense which force us to believe that the ideas of a law of the freedom of the will and of the immortality of the soul are true and that God must exist as the being that will render to every one as he has deserved on earth. This demand of our moral sense is what Kant termed faith. The word revelation on the other hand is to him a metaphorical expression which can only be understood of a psychological process by which our own moral sense unfolds what already slumbers in it as a germ (*spermatikos*).

From this time faith in the Christian religion was shaken to

a considerable extent in Germany and though by the side of the rationalists (a name which became current in place of Naturalists) the Pietists, to whom our next paragraph will avert constantly, exercised a beneficial influence; the former became more numerous, had greater talents among them and wrote more than the latter especially in Church history, since religion had for them only a historical interest. The former principle of impartiality was now converted into that of indifference to the religious tendency of all historical facts. But indifference is the true element of vagueness and the absence of all truth, since the matter bears with it an irresistible interest. Thus their history was without any proper basis and the historians in their frivolity and contempt for religion put any construction upon facts that happened to suit their designs. They attempted indeed to justify their statements but only by their subjective reasoning, by psychological reflections, by practically showing—as they expressed it—the origin of deeds and opinions in the lowest and meanest motives, in avarice, pride, ambition, revenge, party spirit, from which as the roots they maintained all religious rites and institutions to have sprung forth. Thus we see the much praised impartiality with regard to creeds and confessions changed into a prejudice against truth, for what they called historical truth consisted only in establishing historical data. Instead of giving many instances of the contempt which they manifested for religion, I will only mention Spittler's "*Ecclesiastical History*" which is, nevertheless, on many accounts an excellent work. It begins with the following words: "The world never experienced a revolution that was so insignificant in its beginning and so remarkable in its widely spread consequences as that which was caused 1,800 years ago by a Jew called Christ."* Voltaire's witty words were then fulfilled, that

* The same irreverence we find in Eichhorn's "*History of the World*" (1799), Vol. I., p. 274: "Seventy years before the Jews met with this severe catastrophe Jesus had risen among them who by a better philosophy of religion, which He drew out of the old Mosaic, had effected a spiritual revolution which by degrees spread itself over all parts of the world and a great portion of its inhabitants."

"Church history is a gallery of human folly." Wit, satire, humor, ingenuity are now presented to the reader in the place of truth. The principal writers of this period are Spittler (born 1752, d. 1810), *Grundriss der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte*, republished by Planck; Henke (born 1751, d. 1809), *Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirchen*, 3 vols.; Planck (born 1751), *Geschichte des Protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, 6 vols.; Woltman (born 1770, d. 1817), *Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland*, 3 vols. Menzel, etc.

Transition.—After this school had carried out its principles to their full extreme, after its levity, selfishness and infidelity, its wanton destruction of all positive contents in our religion, its poverty of ideas and want of spirit, the lameness of its theories and its despicable views in every science had exhibited themselves fully and without disguise, a general dissatisfaction and disgust with it seized nearly every portion of Germany.

This change was not caused by education nor by views which could be traced historically to their date and hour—but it took place suddenly and at once; not in the ripened minds of the learned but among the youth. As if from idiosyncrasy they turned against rationalism; and their teachers, who favored infidelity, themselves no longer possessing faith had the mortification of seeing the seed they had sown produce fruits neither wished nor designed by them. It was then that every science underwent a change, that philosophy formerly opposed to religion declared itself its servant and willingly acknowledged the supremacy of Christianity, that faith in Christ as the only Saviour of the world forced its way irresistibly among the rising generation; and it was then that ecclesiastical historiography altered its principles. History as has been shown before had lost all its objectiveness and was only the manufacture of the historians of their reflections and psychological reasons. After the consequences of such a historiography had manifested themselves sufficiently, it was demanded of the historian that he should neither be a sectarian

or antichristian, but siding with no party whatever should give facts as met with in their respective sources. Schmidt (born 1772, d. 1829) wrote the first work in this manner, *Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte*, 6 vols., unfinished. He explored sources, made copious extracts and arranged them so that the text is merely the thread that unites them. The most accomplished work of this kind however is that of Gieseler which is almost entirely made up of citations, so that in a country where access to sources is difficult it may be recommended as one of the best substitutes for them. (Note. A work like Eichhorn's "*Antiqua historia ea ipsis veterum Scriptorum (Graecorum et Latinorum) narrationibus contexta*" or one like that of Raumer on the Latin historians of the middle age would answer this purpose better.) The principal good traits in this book are faithfulness, a ripe judgment, readiness on the part of the author to submit all his views to historical truth, a desire to have the reader decide for himself without assuming the office of intellectual guardian, perfect liberality without indifference to religion or its various forms, a conviction that to enter the spirit which breathes in Church history we must possess it ourselves. Yet what distinguishes this history from all prior to it is this—previous to Gieseler all writers have dwelt so long on the first parts of their works that they had neither time nor strength left to perceive or to describe the great total change which has been caused in the life of the Church by the Teutonic nations. Gieseler is the first, except Raumer in his *Hohenstaufen*, who succeeded in pointing it out so that in this respect his history stands unrivalled. To this school may justly be attached the history of Engelhard, 4 vols., which by an admirable brevity comprises in its few volumes more facts than many much larger works. The fourth volume contains a rich collection of literature and of quotations and proves the profound knowledge which the author has of sources. Yet to him every action is a mere occurrence, a phenomenon to whose internal nature, purpose and design the author feels entirely indifferent,

so that that truth, on account of which we alone study Church history, does not everywhere appear. Both Engelhard and Gieseler desire to give pure history and nothing else, to attach fact to fact without expressing any opinion of their own. This is laudable and noble, yet mere facts and their arrangements do not give a full history.

Evangelical School.—In a former paragraph I have alluded to the fact that both rationalists and pietists coincided in the wish that Church history should be impartial. They remained united, however, only until impartiality was converted into indifference and finally into antichristianity, when a reaction took place in the bosoms of the pietists against the rationalists. At first Milner's work, whose design was practical Christianity, satisfied their wishes, afterwards a more poetical representation was looked for since the shallowness, the dry and lifeless manner of the rationalizing school had on this point also caused a counteraction. This desire found its satisfaction in Stollberg's large history (born 1751, d. 1810) "*Die Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi*," 18 vols. 1711, continued by Kerz, 7 vols. 1824-31. Works however, like those of Stollberg and Milner, wanted a solid foundation and it was only Neander that gave this school, whose friends might be called supernaturalists, a scientific character. We are struck at once with the learning of Neander, his thorough acquaintance with historical fountains and his independent investigations into antiquities which frequently produce entirely new results, confirm what was before doubtful and explain what had already been acknowledged. He has likewise entered regions inaccessible or unknown before as may especially be seen from the third volume of his work. It is on this account that his history has become voluminous though it is the great art of historiography to select from the large mass of materials what is most important and to connect with ease what has been gained by labor and perseverance, to articulate facts as in an organism of which one member supports the other. In this latter respect Neander has not perhaps been as

successful as the others. The design of his work is the edification of the reader and he endeavors to effect this by the whole representation and occasionally by pious and devotional reflections. Personal piety is his highest aim, and he desires to show its development in historical characters as qualified by circumstances and education, and to exhibit how from this individual piety—which in his view is peculiar in every person according to disposition, intellect, etc.—many differences in doctrine have proceeded. Hence he does not acknowledge the idea of the Christian Church in the common sense of the term nor a perfect agreement of faith but considers symbolical books as a misfortune limiting the free cultivation of individual piety in which every one would have a faith of his own though derived from one faith.

In the latter respect the recently published work of Guericke may be said to be more definite and more decided. In the opinion of Neander it matters little whether a man is an Arian, a Nestorian or a Calvinist, if he be only pious. Guericke regards symbolical books as a necessity and is a zealous Lutheran. He desires union between Church and State, whilst Neander is strongly opposed to an established Church. Guericke admits that the Church should be a visible body. Neander is in favor of no constitution. Guericke's design is likewise to promote personal piety and to oppose rationalism both in its frivolity and indifference. Yet he dwells less on the development of piety in individuals than in the life of the Church. Her spirit lives in him as his history testifies though in the form of feeling and not that of pure science, which, if the right kind, includes the former.

XII. INFLUENCE OF THE SO-CALLED "NEWEST PHILOSOPHY" ON HISTORIOGRAPHY.

The results of Jacobi's and Kant's philosophy were the same with regard to religion as I have mentioned in a former paragraph; but there was a great difference in the process by which they attained to them. What Jacobi called faith was based

on an instinctive feeling that constrains us to believe and the term faith was according to him to be extended even to empirical and sensual knowledge. We must believe things are as they appear or else question our knowledge of them. Kant's faith on the other hand originated in the postulate of the so-called practical reason or of the moral sense. With the followers of the latter, after they attempted to reconcile the demands of rationalism with revelation, reason became the medium by which to try the truth of a dogma so that revelation was considered true if it revealed nothing contrary to reason; whilst its truths like the light of the sun to the nature of the eye would conform to the wants of reason. As however the light is the medium through which alone the eye is enabled to see and on which it depends for sight, so reason is entirely dependent on eternal truth for revelation. Those on the other hand who embraced Jacobi's system made religious feeling, whose seat was the heart, the touch-stone of every revealed truth and the source of all piety. The immediate effects of Kant's opinions on historiography gave it a more moral tendency; the extreme to which this was carried called forth an opposite tendency and instead of a history made up of psychological reasoning, receive one in which facts are attached to facts without ever polluting historical truth by intermingling individual opinion. Neander and his school on the other hand united the spirit of pietism with the principles of Jacobi. The soul of faith according to them is personal conviction. Whatever faith be, if it be based on conviction, it is sufficient. This conviction must rest on religious feeling which imperatively demands acquiescence in it; yet qualified this feeling, which differs in every one, must be peculiarly characterized in each Christian and should it therefore be forced into a dogmatical system or be modelled by symbolical books it would be cramped and its free development would be impeded.

Hegel's school then again insists on the necessity of symbolical books and on preserving their binding authority and

opposes that of Neander. Without entering however further into particulars I will try to give in as few words as possible a sketch of the manner in which Hegel's school desires ecclesiastical history to be written.

The idea* of the Church as existing in Christ and in its eternal nature being invisible and unchangeable beyond space and time becomes visible by the grace of God in doctrines, discipline and rites, thus receiving existence on earth, has an external history for it is the nature of life and spirit that what they contain in the abstract they unfold and manifest. This idea of the Church as existing in Christ is without differences or oppositions, is a totality, a unity, one whole. But accommodating itself to the consciousness of man, in which it exists spiritually, it shoots forth many branches and develops itself in many degrees and under many forms yet in each of them it is contained and that which affiliates with them and thus

* "Without pretending to give in a short note an accurate definition of the term idea as used with a slight shade of difference by Schelling and Hegel I intend only to show by an imperfect comparison the sense in which it is understood above. We speak of genera and species in the animal world. These genera are not the products of a mere arbitrary division which man made for his convenience. They do not exist merely in our thoughts and through them, but they exist really and every genus preserves itself in its species and its individuals from time to time. The genus as such is invisible (the mere *potentia dunamis*) but in developing itself (in proceeding from *dunamis* to *energeia*, from *potentia* to *actus*) it produces species and individuals in which it becomes visible. If we now would classify animals we can do it only by referring the single individuals to their genus by which they are distinguished from other individuals. This genus is the same as idea comprising all its species and individuals under it. Living and becoming visible in its species and individuals it is however more than they and no single individual is the genus itself though each contains it. If now all genera again are considered in subordination to one that is highest, then this will be the idea which runs through them all. Compare Bockshammer on the 'Freedom of the Human Will,' translated by Kaufman, page 19, note. It is extremely difficult even for those who are minutely acquainted with the German genius to understand Hegel's philosophy and it seems to me that it would be utterly impossible to any one who would not be willing to spend years in studying it. Without eulogizing his system or any philosophy I would say that Hegel opposes nothing so strongly as pietism. Every page of his work goes to prove this."

makes them members of one body, is the eternal idea of the Church from which all proceed. This historical development of the idea of the Church does not alter it nor change anything in it but serves to render it more clear, more distinct, more manifest by exhibiting it under many different aspects in all of which it is the same though none of them contains it more fully. As one life pervades root, trunk, branches, leaves, blossoms and seed, as one blood pulsates in all the members, so all the different portions of the visible Church on earth are penetrated by the idea of the invisible Church. This idea is not only the centre but lives also in the periphery which springs forth from it. It is not only the fountain of light, but springing forth remains in contact with itself in all its expansions. Neander likewise makes the idea of the invisible Church the principal of historiography but maintains that the visible Church on earth is at variance with this idea, that consequently it is not the product of the latter but of opinions and actions which depend on a combination of circumstances.

The first and most indispensable requisite of the historian according to Hegel's school is not only its acknowledgment of this idea of the invisible Church as realizing itself in history but to exhibit all ecclesiastical actions and all systems of divinity as proceeding from it or as being at least indirectly qualified by it, not indeed in an abstract way, but by being communicated to the mind of man and by living and acting in it. The historian must resist the desire to handle history according to his own views, make decisions of his own and the like but must yield all personal wishes and opinions (*ne inferas sed efferas*) to the truth of the idea of the Church which has articulated itself into comprehensive epochs before ever a historian thought of dividing it; just as the natural historian does not divide the tree into trunk and branches but the life in the tree has performed this function itself and the natural historian has only to observe this and to follow. Thus the study of ecclesiastical history would become the same as pure systematic divinity with the only difference that the various parts of truth appear frequently in history according to the

fullest development of which they are susceptible when they strike a nation or some of its individuals more forcibly than all the others. Hence ecclesiastical history is and illustrates systematic divinity. Neither must the historian indulge the opinion, that any event in Church history could have been otherwise than it really occurred as if an action or series of actions were accidental. It is much more the triumph of historiography to prove that the different periods and their regular succession were necessary as it is necessary for the seed first to sink the root into the soil and then shoot forth its trunk, and afterwards the branches, etc. But whilst each period of ecclesiastical history was necessary none can claim the privilege to be the last but must suffer itself in the progress of time and of greater religious knowledge to become elements of a new one that rises from it. It is thus that, though the subject of history is past, its contents are not, but are preserved as the seeds of new productions until the whole shall be complete.

As a model of this kind of historiography I would mention Marheinecke's "*Geschichte der Reformation*." Hase's work on ecclesiastical history approaches this school considerably.

In closing these imperfect remarks on historiography I would state that it has been my design to characterise schools and not merely single historians. It is only then that a correct view of the state of any science may be obtained when we see its gradual advance while a mere notice of individual writers can give only an imperfect idea of their value and the state of the science, just as a leaf broken from the stem can convey but a very inadequate notion of the whole plant. Though historiography in Germany is not yet what we fondly hope it will soon be it must appear sufficiently from the above that it is freeing itself from the dangerous influence of rationalism. Where the genius of a nation is constantly making new efforts none of which can satisfy its expectations, there is no danger but the truth will at length prevail.

The following writers have been made use of: Marheinecke, Rosenkranz, Hase, Bauer, Lehnert, and others.

IX.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE FIFTEENTH TRIENNIAL SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

The General Synod met in Allentown, Pa., a city with eight Reformed congregations counting a membership of 5,500. Every seventh citizen is Reformed. It was the first time the General Synod met in this place. Its easy access by railroads and trolleys, its spacious churches and Sunday-school buildings, its hospitable homes and its central location for at least 50,000 Reformed people made it a most desirable place of meeting. The religious services, the business sessions and the social fellowship have left a lasting impression both on the genial hosts and on the delighted guests. The *Daily City Item*, in a leading editorial, spoke of the Synod as follows: "It had dignity and it came to its responsibilities with becoming gravity and decorum. Its services were inspiring and uplifting. These true and tried servants of God came to us with the message of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and they delivered their message with earnestness and impressiveness. The presence of this host of godly men in our community cannot but have exerted a wholesome influence. Their influence will be felt long after they are gone, and the good they did here will live after them."

The meetings of General Synod are milestones in our denominational history. They mark eras in the development of church life and activity. The most fruitful period of Reformed church history in the United States is the interval of forty-two years which has elapsed since the organization of the General Synod in 1863. A generation of great men, great in scholarship, in preaching, and in service, has passed away. But the fruits of their labors are evident in a comparatively

larger Reformed Church which is now engaged in the solution of practical questions at the opening of a new century. The denominational consciousness has been deepened and clarified. The bonds of fellowship and coöperation between the different sections of the Church have been strengthened. The work of salvation is carried on with sincerity and zeal through the various organs which serve the divine purpose. The spirit of christian activity has laid hold of pastors and people. The glory of the churches is in the part which they take in the benevolent operations of the denomination. A comparative view of statistics will show the progress of the Church.

In 1879 the receipts for Foreign Missions were about \$7,000; in the last three years they were \$237,000, more than double the amount of the previous triennium. In 1876 the receipts for congregational purposes were \$532,228 and for benevolent purposes \$61,727; the membership was \$147,788. Now the receipts for congregational purposes are \$1,450,247, for benevolence, \$281,892; the membership is 263,954 communicants and 127,800 unconfirmed. Compared with the previous three years the increase in benevolent contributions is \$90,744, and for congregational purposes \$147,988. In the last 30 years the contributions for congregational purposes have more than doubled, those for benevolence have trebled, and the membership has nearly doubled. These facts are convincing evidence that the Church is growing not only numerically, but spiritually. It is a normal and healthful expansion based largely on the methods which belong to the educational system of religion.

The significance of a General Synod is in its personnel and in its business. The delegates, pastors and elders, represented 58 classes whose territory extends across the continent. The different types of national and denominational life were in evidence. The suave Southerner, the energetic Westerner, and the staid Easterner sat side by side. A patriarch from Canada, with an undimmed eye and natural force unabated, was a living example of the heroic missionary work in those

regions. The English, the German and the Pennsylvania German members were an indication of the complexity of our national heritage as well as of the diversity of problems which confront the Church in its practical work. The stirring appeals by the young missionaries from the West and the South renewed the spirit of coöperation and pointed out the path of progress in the present generation. The men and women from Japan and China, whose countenances reflected the work of their lives, were the proof of past achievements and the promise of future success. The casual observer could see some men, who were in the twilight of their ministry, others in the zenith, and others in the dawn. How different the synod must have appeared from these various points of view! Theological questions were not discussed. The lines between orthodoxy and heresy were not drawn. The utterances from the pulpit and the platform struck an ethical rather than a doctrinal note. Yet it cannot be denied that there are different tendencies in theology in the Reformed Church, and that representatives of these tendencies were on the floor of the synod. If such were not the case one element of strength in the Church would be gone. A dead uniformity is far worse than a living diversity. In their loyalty to Christ, however, in zeal for righteousness, in self-sacrificing labor men of all schools were united. There were strong preachers, heroic missionaries, faithful pastors, learned teachers, keen parliamentarians and effective debaters. The delegates were justly proud of their presiding officer, Dr. A. E. Dahlman of Buffalo, who was chosen by a unanimous vote. From day to day he won the confidence and admiration of the synod by his quickness and clearness, his firmness and fairness, his mastery of himself and of parliamentary rules. Not a single appeal from his decisions was taken. His presidency will stand out as one of the most brilliant in the history of general synods.

The business of a General Synod has to do with matters that relate to the whole Church. The work of the past trennium is reported by the Boards—Home and Foreign Mis-

sions, Education, Publications, Orphans' Homes and Sunday-Schools. The transactions of synods and classes are carefully reviewed. The plan of operation for the coming triennium is adopted. Resolutions and decisions are therefore far-reaching and affect every member of the Church. In many instances action is taken which will determine the denominational life for generations to come. The realization of this fact gave dignity and solemnity to all the deliberations. Great responsibility rested on the committees who framed resolutions for adoption. The members were alert and engaged in lively discussions, in which there was a remarkable freedom of expression and yet an absence of personalities. Appeals to prejudice, special pleading, questionable and baseless insinuations were easily detected and failed in effect.

The interest centered in the draft of a new constitution, the missionary work, and the union or federation of churches. Moral questions also were raised which claimed no little attention.

A brief resume of the history of the attempts at revision of the constitution will throw light on the difficulty of the problem before this General Synod. The demand for a revised constitution arose with the organization of the General Synod in 1863.

The following are the General Synods which appointed committees on revision of the constitution since 1866, and the number of men and chairmen of the committees:

The General Synod at Dayton, O., 1866—5 ministers, 3 elders, Dr. Thos. G. Apple, chairman; Philadelphia, Pa., 1869—9 ministers, 2 elders, Dr. Thos. G. Apple, chairman; Cincinnati, O., 1872—District Synodical Coms. of 3 to coöperate in framing a draft; Ft. Wayne, Ind., 1875—3 ministers, 3 elders, Dr. Samuel R. Fisher, chairman; Lebanon, Pa., 1890—7 ministers, 2 elders, Dr. H. W. W. Hibshman, chairman; Baltimore, Md., 1902—3 ministers, 2 elders, Dr. Geo. W. Richards, chairman.

If the draft of the last committee, which with amendments

was unanimously submitted to the classes for adoption, will be accepted, its acceptance will be the result not merely of the labors of the committee which presented it, but of the joint efforts of all the committees which preceded. The committee particularly acknowledges its indebtedness to the authors of the draft submitted to the General Synod at Reading, Pa., 1893.

In the preparation and discussion of the new draft two theories of church polity came to light. The one is congregational in its tendency; the other, presbyterial. The difference between the two theories appears in defining the relation of the classis to the congregation. Who, for example, has authority to supply the pulpit of a vacant congregation? The past practice of the Reformed Church implies that the authority is vested in the classis. Statistics received from the stated clerks show that for the current year 43 classes have appointed supply committees; two do so only when requested; one, unless requested not to do so; one, as an advisory committee; six appoint no committees; two did not reply. More than two thirds of the classes have acted upon the theory that in cases of vacancy they are to take charge of the pulpit and in coöperation with the consistory arrange for a supply. The new draft, however, in response to a demand from certain sections, yielded the right of temporary supply to the consistory while the classis has only advisory rights. Temporary supply is defined as lasting not longer than a year, after which time the authority to supply reverts to the classis, Art. 70, new draft. The right of permanent supply, however, remains with the classis. Art. 20 says: "Nor shall a minister serve a vacant congregation or charge as a regular supply without the consent of the classis to which the congregation or charge belongs." While the classis gives up some of its rights in the matter of temporary supply, the principle remains unaltered that classis has authority over vacant pulpits. It has power to prevent a preacher to act as regular supply; it must confirm a call and constitute and dissolve pastoral relations. The

new draft is still presbyterial in its provision for the filling of pulpits of the congregations.

Another crucial point is the right to divide and reconstruct charges. The old constitution, Art. 51, mentions among the rights of classis "the decision of controversies between existing congregations, and the forming and dissolving of connections, as may be requested, or the classis may deem expedient." According to the wording of the latter clause a classis has authority, if the interests of religion demand it, to divide and reconstruct a charge even when the consistories of the charges involved are opposed to such action. The new draft in Art. 86 maintained this right of classis in the old constitution. On this point the warmest discussions of the sessions were held. A concession of authority to the congregations was considered by many a renunciation of our presbyterial polity, of our past history, and of an important prerogative in regard to the pastoral oversight of the classis over its congregations or charges. Two amendments to the original article were finally accepted by the committee and approved by the synod. They were as follows: "Classis however shall only exercise its right of reconstructing charges after it has made reasonable efforts to procure the consent of the consistories in the charges involved," and "provided, however, that charges can only be divided by a two-thirds vote of classis."

The authority over charges remains, as it has always been, in the classis. It can be exercised in the matter of reconstruction and division only after proper consultation with the consistories and by a two-thirds vote of the classis. These provisions are to safeguard the rights of the people. Yet the principles of presbyterial polity remain intact.

The last point seriously contested was in reference to the last sentence of Art. 103. It reads thus: "The decision of a synod in all cases of complaint or appeal shall be final, except on questions concerning doctrine, cultus and the construction of the constitution." The purpose of this provision in the mind of the committee was to prevent the flooding of the

General Synod with appeals and complaints of a personal and comparatively trivial nature. There has also been a demand for such a limitation for years from the most experienced men of the Church. The Fathers who drew up the articles in the report of the Peace Commission called special attention to this point in the event that a new constitution was prepared. One of the recommendations was "to provide (in the new constitution) some mode by which all cases of appeal, involving only facts and individual disputes, shall be excluded from the General Synod, so that such only as relate to controversies on doctrine, cultus and constitutional construction may be brought for a final hearing before that body." By an amendment, however, the sentence limiting certain appeals and complaints to district synods was stricken out and a free access was granted for all cases to the General Synod. One cannot help but observe that even General Synods will contradict themselves. For the recommendation of the Peace Commission and the action of the synod on this point are directly contradictory.

We may mention in passing other salient features of the new draft which were accepted without discussion. The office of professor of theology has been changed into a function of the minister of the Word. The work of deaconesses is recognised. An executive committee of classis and a judicial committee of the General Synod are provided for. The part on discipline has been carefully prepared in the hope of simplifying what has always been a complicated process. Judging from the unanimity with which the amended draft was submitted to the classes for final consideration, the committee may cherish a reasonable hope that the new constitution will be adopted.

With the consideration of the constitution left out, the last General Synod might be called a grand missionary meeting. About one-fourth of the time was devoted to reports, speeches and discussions on Home and Foreign Missions. The reports of the Boards were full of encouragement. The contribu-

tions largely exceeded those of the previous triennium. The ministry and membership of the Church are awakening not only to a sense of duty but also of privilege in regard to missions. No little credit is due to the enthusiastic Womens' Missionary Society which met at the same time. The presence of Mr. and Mrs. Hoy, of China, and Mr. and Mrs. Schneder, of Japan, the leaders of our foreign work in those lands, gave special interest to the meetings and made a deep impression on the members of synod. They brought a message of encouragement and pled for special efforts particularly during the critical time through which Japan is passing at present. Dr. Schneder thrilled his audience when he related the conversation he had before his departure for America with Count Katsura, the Prime Minister of Japan, who said: "The Japanese government welcomes Christian effort." Dr. Schneder also expressed his conviction that within twenty-five years the Christians of Japan could conduct their work without much foreign assistance.

The young missionaries from the West and South won the confidence of the synod by their manly bearing, their sane optimism and their undemonstrative determination. Those, who have visited their fields and know the work which they are doing, have some conception of the heroic element in their lives. A stronger ministry than we have in our home missionary field is hard to find anywhere. Our missionaries are men and women who would adorn the pastorate in the leading churches of the East. It is becoming clear that in the regions beyond the Mississippi aggressive measures must be taken in the next decade to support the missions already established. They need neighboring missions, groups of congregations in St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, Des Moines and other central cities. The English missions are a necessary counterpart of the German missions in those states. The two must coöperate in fulfilling our mission in the West.

Happily the consideration of missions has taken the place in the General Synod of liturgical and theological controversy.

The latter gave more opportunity for the display of scholarship and intellectual power—the Greek virtues; the former has developed another class of men who rank among the first of their age in quiet service and sacrifice—the Christian virtues. Controversies divided the Church and alienated brethren. Missions have united the Church and inspired confidence between brethren. Both periods serve a purpose in the history of the Church. Yet, when one measures a denomination with the apostolic standards, the Reformed Church stands the test as never before in its American history.

The world-wide tendency toward a closer fellowship between the churches found expression in several overtures to the synod for church union or church federation. Some of the overtures came from district synods within the Reformed Church, others from denominations or organizations outside. An organic union and a federal union with the Presbyterian Church were proposed. An invitation to appoint delegates to an Interdenominational Conference to be held in New York in November was also received.

It is a noteworthy fact that church union was one of the chief questions in the May meetings of the protestant churches. The Northern and Southern Baptists organized a permanent body to be known as the General Convention of the Baptists of North America. The United Brethren agreed to accept the plan of federation with the Congregationalists and the Methodist Protestants, looking to complete consolidation in the future. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. took final action in favor of organic union with the Cumberland Presbyterians. The unions in the main are effected along historic lines and between churches of the same type. In spite of an inflexible conservatism in all of these bodies the more liberal spirit of tolerance and fellowship is predominant, and many of the divisions in the fold of Christ are passing away.

The committee, to whom the overtures on union were referred, reported favorably on a federation of churches holding

the presbyterial system of polity, and on sending delegates to the Interdenominational Conference. The report, however, did not advocate organic union with the Presbyterians on the ground that the Reformed Church was not yet prepared to be absorbed or swallowed. There are certain national, temperamental and theological characteristics which a denomination cannot surrender but must outgrow. To surrender personal convictions would be too costly a price even for church unity. The work of American protestantism will be best accomplished by the preservation of the historic lines of the past and the national characteristics which have been brought from the Old world to the New. These will gradually pass away, but not by synodical resolution or mutual consent. Such changes can come about only by the slow processes of historic development. We believe that the Church of the Heidelberg Catechism and of three of the leading nations on the continent has a distinctive character and serves a mission of its own in the Christian life of the coming century. In the meantime, however, let the spirit of Christian fellowship prevail and let all churches coöperate in the work of salvation.

The ethical and social tendencies, which are so strong in the present generation, manifested themselves in two resolutions. The one proposed an amendment to Art. 124 of the new constitution, making dancing, theatre-going and card-playing by church members sins meriting discipline. The other was a resolution for the appointment of delegates to the convention of the Anti-Saloon League. Both of these resolutions were aimed at growing evils in our social life. To neither of them the Church can be indifferent. The zeal with which some of the members advocated these measures was worthy of admiration. Yet the wisdom of combatting the evils in the way proposed was questioned by many. It was argued that card-playing, theatre-going and dancing were not sins in themselves and could therefore not be classed with adultery, fornication and theft. There may be a proper use of these amusements, and it is the work of the Church to teach temperance

rather than suppression in regard to these matters. Others took a more puritanic position claiming that they are harmful always, if not sinful altogether. The Synod felt, however, that it was unwise to incorporate in the constitution prohibitions on which the most enlightened Christian consciences differ so widely. These are questions that must be solved by the persuasive power of preaching more than by the constraints of discipline.

The delegates were of one mind in regard to the baneful influence of the saloon. It is a cancer on the social organism which ought to be eradicated speedily. The members and ministers of the Reformed Church ought to do all in their power to remove the evil. But the question of sending delegates from an ecclesiastical body to an organization of which the delegates have no official information is altogether different from that of opposing the saloon or of favoring temperance legislation. It is one thing to recognize a social evil and another thing to adopt a method of fighting it. A General Synod has no right to bind its members to a plan of procedure by action that may be more zealous than wise. The proposed meeting of protestant churches in November in New York will doubtless result in a definite plan on which all branches of the Church can unite in combating vice and in furthering virtue in the spirit of evangelical Christianity. A committee of investigation has been appointed to visit the convention of the Anti-Saloon League and report at the next regular session of the synod. This was doubtless a wise provision and will leave freedom for intelligent action hereafter.

It is safe to say that the General Synod has made history. The spirit of compromise prevailed on many points, which was due to a deep longing in the Church for the cessation of controversy and for fraternal fellowship. Every element in the Church received due recognition and respectful hearing. Votes were cast regardless of lines which have been drawn in the past. Prejudices are not altogether removed, probably never can be, but men are endeavoring to live by principle

more than by prejudice. The millenium has not yet come in the Reformed Church. The age of controversy is not altogether past. New issues will arise, conscientious differences will appear, and in the honest grappling with problems, struggling after truth, and seeking righteousness the Reformed Church will work out its salvation and contribute its portion to the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. The welfare of a denomination is in a mind quick to comprehend truth, a will strong to do right, and a heart warm with love for God and the brethren. The ordinances and actions of a synod become effective only when they are sustained by the spirit of Christ in the lives of the people.

G. W. R.

X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF CHRIST, its Significance and Value in the History of Religion, expanded from a lecture delivered before the International Theological Congress at Amsterdam, September, 1903, by Otto Pfeiderer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pages 170. Crown Theological Library.

Those who are not in sympathy with the historico-critical method of interpreting the gospels and church history will not find this volume satisfactory. They can read it only under protest from beginning to end. Those, however, who accept the theory that "Jewish prophecy, Rabbinic teaching, Oriental gnosis, and Greek philosophy have already mingled their colours upon the palette from which the portrait of Christ in the New Testament Scriptures is painted," will find in this essay a valuable contribution to the study of Christian origins. Whatever standpoint the thoughtful reader may hold, he cannot read this volume without a widening of his scope of vision of the religious concepts of the ancient world and of their relation to Christianity.

Dr. Pfeiderer considers one of the permanent contributions of the nineteenth century to theology the ability "to distinguish between the Christ of Faith and the man Jesus of history, two entities which have been identified by ecclesiastical dogma." Out of the Jesus of history gradually grew the dogma of the God-man which is a combination of religious ideas from many sources with the reminiscences of the early Church concerning the life of her Master. Thus in a manner the Church in every age creates its Christ out of the elements of the historical Jesus and the common religious spirit of the time. Whether we take Renan's *Life of Jesus* or Harnack's *What is Christianity*, we cannot accept either of them as representing "the result of genuine historical research" and "bearing to the ancient portrait the relation of truth to falsehood." Both the modern and the ancient pictures of the Christ are alike creations of the common religious spirit of their times. They have sprung from the natural craving of faith to fix and to illustrate the principle of its life in a typical form. In the ancient portrait we have the simple epic of myth, in the modern the romance of sentiment and reflection.

With this presupposition the author seeks to account for the elements which entered into the dogmatic views of Jesus by a comparative study of religion. He finds certain fundamental

tendencies common to all religions; they are the yearnings and aspirations of the nations after a higher life. These find their most satisfactory expression in Christ. "The sphere of comparative religion," he says, "offers to the theology of the twentieth century a rich field of labor, whose culture will result in the clearing up of many problems to which Biblical exegesis and criticism so far found no satisfactory solution." In this essay, accordingly, he ventures to lay before the reader an investigation of the primitive conception of Christ in the light of the history of religion.

In five sections the following topics are treated: Christ as Son of God, Christ as Conqueror of Satan, Christ as Wonder-worker, Christ as the Conqueror of Death and the Life-Giver, Christ as the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Conclusion.

The method of treatment can be shown by an analysis of one chapter, for example the first on Christ as the Son of God. The Christians from the beginning believed that Jesus was the "Son of God." But the term "Son of God" had at least three distinct meanings. First, the man Jesus Christ was raised to be the Son of God by a divine act of adoption which was at first connected with the Resurrection from the dead, and afterwards with the voice from Heaven at the Baptism, when by the descent of the Spirit He was endowed with miraculous Messianic power. This view did not imply that his nature, but his office, was supernatural. Second, Jesus was the Son of God because a spiritual personality, preëxisting in Heaven, had become incarnate in Him. This Christ-Spirit was not yet thought of as God, but as the peculiar first-born Son and express image of God, and moreover as the archtype of mankind, the heavenly ideal man who was destined from the beginning to appear in earthly form that he might redeem mankind from the curse of sin, of the law, of death. This is the view of Paul. Third, these two conceptions of the incarnation of a God and of the apotheosis of a man were combined in another view, that Christ was the Son of God because He was supernaturally conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, and so, although human because of His mother, He was yet the Son of God in the most complete physical sense of the word. This view arose in the second century among the Gentile Christians and became the prevalent one in the Church.

These three distinct conceptions of the Sonship of Christ have close parallels in Judaism and in Gentile religions. The idea that Jesus was the adopted Son of God is found in the Israelitic belief in the intimate connection of the kingship of David with Jahovah the nation's God. In 2 Sam. 7: 13 sq. God says to David: "To thy seed I will establish the kingdom forever, I will be his father, and he shall be my Son." In the second Psalm

likewise: "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee." In this sense the Jews hoped for the anointed king, the Messiah, who, as Son of David, would be therefore Son of God—that is, His chosen and beloved client and vassal. In the Psalms of Solomon and in the later apocalyptic literature there is found a parallel to the second conception cited above. The Messiah is not a mere man but a mysterious spirit-nature proceeding from the secret places of the Heavens. In the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch the Messiah is described as the "Chosen One," "the Son of Man," who was hidden with God before the world was, whose dominion endureth from eternity to eternity. Similiar statements are found in the Apocalypse of Ezra, in the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon and in the Alexandrine philosophers.

The conception of divine sonship was common among the Gentiles. Not only were the mythical characters so honored but historical persons—rulers and sages. In Egypt the king was regarded as an incarnation of the deity. The Babylonian kings were regarded as emanations of the Godhead. Alexander the Great permitted himself to be styled the Son of the Egyptian God Ammon-Ra. In Rome even since the time of Augustus divine honor was ascribed to the "genius" of the emperor. Parallels are traced in the same manner to the other early views of Christ in the remaining sections of the book.

One naturally stops to ask what is the effect of such an investigation upon the originality and reality of Christian doctrines? The author in a section, entitled "Conclusion," presents his views on this point. The numerous points of likeness between the faith of the early Christians and the religious ideas current in the world around them show that Christianity could not have fallen from Heaven as something quite new and unique, but that it sprang up in the world of those days as the ripe fruit of ages of development and in a soil that was already prepared. He warns both conservatives and radicals from drawing hasty conclusions and imagining that Christianity is robbed of its unique character and its abiding worth because it appears to be nothing more than a combination of ideas that had existed for ages.

It would be a serious error, for example, to attempt to derive the conception of the Divine Sonship of Christ from some definite pre-Christian legend. It is true that in one form or another this conception is the common property of the religions of humanity of all ages and has its ultimate source in the depths of the religious consciousness of mankind. Traces of it are found in all religions. The Christian conception of sonship however is not derived from the nature myth but from the historical fact of the death of Jesus, and the visions of Him risen. The

parallels simply prove that "the religious interpretation of the Spiritual experiences in the consciousness of the Church did not depend upon caprice or accident, but was the expression of the same eternal law whose sacred truth had impressed itself upon mankind from the beginning—the law that the corn of wheat must die in order to bring forth fruit, and that the Son of Man must suffer that He may enter into His glory. The *leit motiv* of the Christian drama of Redemption, "Through Death to Life!" is in some form or other preshadowed in the myths and ceremonies of many religions, and by this very fact is declared to be one of those elementary fundamental truths which were not expressed for the first time in the Christian religion, though they were there revealed in their purest, because ethical and spiritual form."

Enough has been cited to let the reader determine the character of the book. How far the author has succeeded in throwing light on the Christian conception of Christ and at the same time has made the Christ stand out more prominently among the founders of religion the reader of the volume may determine. The book is not a translation from the German. Dr. Pfeleiderer is one of the few German professors who can write almost with equal ease the German and English languages. The style is not cumbersome but simple, fluent and fascinating.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

THE TREND IN HIGHER EDUCATION. By William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1905. Pages 390. Price \$1.50.

Dr. Harper has gathered a series of twenty-three addresses and papers on educational questions, delivered on different occasions, in the form of the present volume. Its title, "Trend in Higher Education," implies that in the higher education of the present time there is a trend in a particular direction; tendencies are moving toward a specific goal. In the first address, entitled "The University and Democracy," which was delivered as the Charter Day address, 1899, at the University of California, he defines the title of the volume more than in any other. The trend is briefly stated the democratising of the University. "The three birth-marks of a university are, therefore, self-government, freedom from ecclesiastical control, and the right of free utterance. And these certainly give it the right to proclaim itself an institution of the people, an institution born of the democratic spirit." In a clear and sane way he expands these three characteristics and shows how they have become molding principles in American scholarship.

There is scarcely a phase of higher educational work which is not touched in one or the other of the addresses. Among the subjects discussed are: The University and Religious Education, Waste in Higher Education, Dependence of the West upon the East, Higher Education in the West, The Contribution of Johns Hopkins, Are School Teachers Underpaid, Why are there Fewer Students for the Ministry, Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, Shall College Athletics be Endowed, Latin versus Science, The Length of the College Course, The Situation of the Small College, etc. The diversity of subjects treated in a masterly way is indeed a proof of the manysided mind of the author. Semitics is his specialty and yet he seems to have his eye on every department of modern education.

One who writes on so many subjects and on so many on which there is room for differences of opinion among doctors, will arouse opposition and be subject to criticism. Yet no one can do Dr. Harper justice by reading the garbled reports of his utterances in the daily newspaper or the bigoted periodical. A close study of this volume will convince the reader that the author is an enthusiast, and yet his enthusiasm is not without knowledge. He has a scientific mind. His deductions are based on the facts won by wide reading, long experience, and a sympathetic touch with men and affairs. The conclusions which he reaches, though one may differ from them, are not drawn out of thin air but are the product of close observation and calm deliberation.

We were particularly interested in the sections on the Theological Seminary. He opens new lines of thought for professors and students in these institutions. He presents suggestions which, if not adopted as a whole, must be reckoned with by all who are seeking the improvement of the Theological School.

The volume doubtless accomplishes the purpose for which it was intended. In the preface we are told that these papers are offered "as a contribution in a small way toward a statement of the educational questions current in our day, * * * and that they might serve as a notebook in the great educational laboratory of which all such effort forms a part." The teacher in almost any school, the student of educational questions, and the interpreter of the tendencies of our age will not fail to acquaint himself with the views of one of the most prominent and successful educators of this generation.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

LUTHER'S CHURCH POSTIL, Gospels first to twelfth Sunday after Trinity. Translated now for the first time into English. With introduction, Walch's analyses and Bugenhagen's "Summaries." By Professor John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Vol. IV. Minneapolis, Minn., Lutherans in All Lands Co. Pages 390. Price \$2.25.

Professor Lenker has undertaken a great task in his laudable effort to present all the writings of Luther to the English-speaking world in its own tongue. It is a work that should appeal not only to the Lutheran Church but to Protestantism in general. For Luther belongs not simply to that branch of the Church which bears his name. Evangelical Christians the world over will honor him as one of the Fathers of the Church. We are glad, therefore, to read in the introduction of this volume that "the English Luther has been welcomed and commended more generally and more heartily by the scholars and the press of the Reformed Churches than had been anticipated."

This volume contains Luther's sermons on the Gospels from the first Sunday after Trinity to the twelfth Sunday after Trinity. For a number of Sundays two or three sermons are published. Each sermon is prefaced by the date and circumstances of its delivery and whatever historical data belong to it. The analyses of the contents by Walch and a summary of the Gospel by Bugenhagen present a bird's-eye view of the contents of the sermons and show the richness of material in them. According to Dr. Lenker the sermons on the Gospels are the best of the twenty volumes of sermons in German. For those who desire only a single volume of this series to become acquainted with the style and substance of the great Reformer, this would be the most desirable.

Why should we still pay attention to Luther's sermons? There is more reason than one. They may indeed contain material that is no longer pertinent to the age in which we live. They may present views that are no longer tenable. Luther lived in the sixteenth century, was a child of his age, and could not possibly preach to the twentieth century. Still we ought to read Luther. He was the greatest "*volksprediger*," preacher of the people, of the great Reformers. He had a genius for preaching greater than that of Zwingli or of Calvin. The latter may have excelled him in other respects, but he had no superior, if an equal, on the pulpit. He could translate the Gospel into the language of his age, intellectually, socially, morally, spiritually. He experienced the good news of salvation in his own struggles after peace, and this experience with his unique personality prepared him to speak to his time as few men ever did. We should naturally expect to find in the sermons of such a man less of the ephemeral and more of the permanent than is found in most sermons.

Preachers, therefore, may study him as one of the masters of their art. Students should read him both for historical and homiletical purposes. The christian layman will find a thoroughness of treatment and a diversity of view in them which will be a welcome contrast to the inflated discourses of many a modern pulpit.

But in sermons there is far more historical material than is generally imagined. To know Luther we need to study more than his philosophical and theological discussions. We see him in his sermons, prayers and hymns as we cannot find him in the more scholarly writings. Not only do we learn to know him, but also his age. He touches all the vital questions of the times, social, political, moral and personal matters, and applies the teachings of the Scriptures to them. The historian will want to study Luther through his sermons. Space will not allow us to analyse the different sermons in detail. We find the translation satisfactory. There is a freshness in the material which keeps the attention of the reader. At every turn of the page one is surprised at the exhaustive treatment of the text. Take, for example, the sermon on the Rich Man and Lazarus and you will find an abundance of material for sermons that are directly applicable to our age. Principles are stated which become seed thoughts and grow into original discourses. While we do not profess to be a Lutherolater, we nevertheless class him among the prophets of the ages and rejoice in the prospect of having a complete edition of his works in the English language.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

THE LIMITS OF EVOLUTION and Other Essays Illustrating the Metaphysical Theory of Personal Idealism. By G. H. Howison, LL.D. Second Edition. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages lviii + 450.

The venerable Dr. Howison, professor of philosophy in the University of California, is a staunch advocate of what he calls "harmonic pluralism" in opposition to the current doctrine of monism. For him the ultimate reality is not Mind, but minds. "Time and space, and all that both 'contain,' owe their entire existence to the essential correlation and coexistence of minds." "God the fulfilled Type of every mind, the living Bond of their union, reigns in it not by the exercise of power but solely by light; not by authority, but by reason; not by efficient, but by final causation." "There is nothing at all, prior to them, out of which their being arises; they are not 'things' in the chain of efficient causation. They simply *are*, and together constitute the eternal order." "The key to the whole view is found in its doctrine concerning the system of causation. It reduces Efficient

Cause from that supreme place which this has hitherto held, and gives the highest, the organizing place to Final Cause instead."

From these quotations the reader may get an inkling of Dr. Howison's system of thought. He resolutely and consistently subordinates the physical to the ethical. In the first edition (1900) he designated his principle "personal idealism," and now feels aggrieved because in 1902 eight members of the University of Oxford published a volume of philosophical essays under the same title, "Personal Idealism," although the theory propounded by them seems quite different from his own. He charges the essayists of Oxford with experientialism, mysticism and "voluntaryism." "Idealism," he protests, "is constituted by the metaphysical value it sets upon ideals, not by the æsthetic or the ethical.

This book is not put forth as a systematic exposition of the theory,—a task which the author still hopes to accomplish. The volume consists of a series of essays on certain great topics of general interest, which each in its own way, illustrates the need and the significance of the theory for which the author stands.

Some of the essays, written twenty years ago, in their original form betray the fact that the author was then a Hegelian monist. He has since reached the conviction that monism is incompatible with the ideas of real personality and liberty and has modified his statements accordingly. But it does him no injustice to say that the spirit of Hegelian speculative boldness still pervades his work. Like others he has made a fresh start from the position of Kant: "Nature is a system of experiences, the matter of which is sensation, while the form or fixed order of it is determined by the elements—Space, Time, Cause and so forth—that the self-active consciousness supplies." But he would "break down the Kantian barrier between the 'practical' and the 'theoretical' consciousness." Minds construct the world; but they themselves are subject only to final, not to efficient, causation, their very existence depending only on a spontaneous mutual recognition. Comparing his system with the monadology of Leibnitz the author says that his scheme "replaces the theory of preëstablished harmony by that of spontaneous harmony."

The essays have their own value, apart from their relations to the author's system. In the first essay on the limits of evolution it is shown that so far as science is concerned the theory of evolution is strictly confined to the sphere of biology. It cannot even close the break between its realm and the inorganic on the one hand and thought on the other. When evolution presumes to be a philosophy of universal validity it requires the elements

of time and space, progress, cause, unity, the ideal,—all of which are organic in the human mind, absolutely *a priori*, not acquired gradually or imparted. "What is most distinctively meant by man is not, and cannot be, the result of evolution. If we deny the transcendent character of human personality as over against nature, "then the Eternal is not a person, there is no God, and our faith is vain."

The essay on pantheism takes the ground that this doctrine, in its acosmic form, is superior to deism or "popular thaumaturgical theism" and prepares the way for genuine theism. In this connection the author brings in a Hegelian interpretation of the Trinity, speaking of a "perpetual incarnation," and so forth. It is devoutly to be wished that philosophers would refrain from using terms like these in senses that they never have in ordinary Christian usage. But one suggestion, by the way, is well worthy of adoption. Our author recommends the substitution of the term "zoömorphism" for "anthropomorphism," for the reason that the latter is aimed at physical, not distinctively human, characteristics of man. The essay goes on to show that pantheism as maintaining the sole causality of God involves the obliteration of liberty and consequently of "any immortality worth the having," and is, therefore, an insufficient theory. While the science of nature, sacrificing the part to the whole, as in the doctrines of the conservation and dissipation of energy and of natural selection, seems responsible for the present trend toward pantheism, it must be remembered that "science accords best with purified theism, though in itself quite unable to attain to the view."

Dr. Howison is at his best as an expositor and critic. In his essay on "Later German Philosophy" he reviews Hartmann's pessimistic philosophy of the unconscious and Duehring's optimistic philosophy of the actual, demonstrating the unsatisfactory character of these two systems, and then proceeds to a keen criticism of the Neo-Kantian agnosticism of Lange's *History of Materialism*. Not only the ideas of time, space, cause, etc., but also the very distinction between phenomenon and noumenon must be of *a priori* origin. Is there a thing-in-itself or is there not? If we say there is, we have abandoned the agnostic principle. If we say there is not, the phenomenal world is all there is to know. After this fashion Dr. Howison would compel Lange, in spite of himself, to demonstrate his theory of idealism.

There are also equally interesting and instructive essays on the art-principle in poetry, the relation of reason to religion, the argument for immortality and the harmony of determinism and freedom. Into the merits of these we cannot now enter.

The lengthy prefaces and fifty pages of appendices deal with possible misapprehensions and with some criticisms of the first edition. There is a full index.

The style is remarkably clear for such a work. The author does not consider it beneath the dignity of a philosopher to use a colloquial expression once in a while. Speaking of Hartmann's rather inconsistent condemnation of suicide, it seems to him difficult to see why "suicide doesn't 'get there all the same.'" *Das Ding an sich* is "something existing 'on its own hook.'" But let us not criticise such expressions; for the first duty of a philosopher is to make his meaning plain.

The book is heartily recommended as stimulating to thought on a variety of timely topics. It is full of very quotable sentences. In regard to the general aim and tendency the Christian mind will respond with sympathy to the appeal in the dedication "to all who feel a deep concern for the dignity of the soul." The philosophy of the twentieth century will no doubt center in the problem of personality. But so far as harmonic pluralism is concerned the kindest thing that this reviewer can say is that he is still too much under the dominion of common sense to follow with enthusiasm. Does not regard for the "dignity of the soul" perhaps involve considerable respect for the common sense of mankind?

CHRISTOPHER NOSS.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON AMOS AND HOSEA. By William Rainey Harper, Professor of Semitic languages and Literature in the University of Chicago. New York, Charles Scribners Sons, 1905. Pp. clxxxi + 424. Price \$3.00.

This is the latest volume of the International Critical Commentary, the first of which, Driver's *Deuteronomy*, appeared in 1895. During the past decade twelve volumes have been given to the public, six on the Old Testament, and six on the New. It is the fruit of the ripest Biblical scholarship in Great Britain and America, and witnesses to the marvelous progress in criticism and exegesis among the English-speaking nations, since the publication of the so-called "Speakers Commentary," less than a generation ago. Its great merits are universally acknowledged. We believe a long time will elapse before it is superseded by another and better English Commentary on the whole Bible.

The preparation of the volumes on the Minor Prophets was assigned to Dr. W. R. Harper. The original plan contemplated only two volumes; but it was found that, if the work was to be satisfactorily done, it must include three, of which this on *Amos* and *Hosea* is the first; to be followed by a second, on *Micah*, *Nahum*, *Habakkuk*, *Zephaniah* and *Obadiah*, and by a third, on

Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Joel and Jonah. It will be noticed by the reader that the order of the twelve Minor Prophets as here given, is neither that of the English version, which follows the order of the Hebrew Bible, nor yet that of the ancient Greek version. The author has wisely chosen to rearrange them according to what he holds to be their chronological succession. In this view he is in accord with most modern critics, except that Zephaniah is usually placed before Nahum.

Dr. Harper is eminently fitted for the task he has undertaken. A mere glance into this volume is sufficient to reveal his broad general scholarship; his wide and accurate knowledge of the semitic languages; his intimate acquaintance with the geography, archæology, history and theology of the Old Testament; his qualifications for Biblical criticism, both historical and textual; his skill as an interpreter; his sympathy with the spirit of the Old Testament and reverence for its religious and moral truth. He may not have opened up new paths, nor given to the theological world much that is distinctively original; but his wonderful grasp on the entire literature bearing on his subject, and his careful, sober judgments on all disputed points invest him with unquestionable authority on the problems of Old Testament criticism and exegesis. Such qualifications lead us to expect a work of great interest and value; nor are we disappointed.

Amos and Hosea are the first representatives of prophecy in its written form. There is an advantage to the interpreter in taking them together, "not only because one follows the other chronologically, but also because one supplements the other logically"; and "while each is in sharp contrast with the other in temperament and in message, neither, by himself, is complete. They must both be taken to secure the whole idea." In them prophecy appears in a new aspect, differing widely from the *Nebhi'ism* of the pre-prophetic age. It no longer resorts to violence as in the time of Samuel, Elijah and Elisha; it employs only spiritual means. This suggests some important questions which, on account of the meagreness of our historical sources, it is difficult to answer in a satisfactory way. Were Amos and Hosea the creators of prophecy in its lofty spiritual form? Or had they forerunners who gradually prepared the way for them? And what were the connecting links between the enthusiastic, ecstatic *Nebhi'ism* of Samuel's age and the great literary prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries, B. C. The author has given much space to the difficult task of solving these perplexing problems.

Dr. Harper's treatment of all important questions is very full; at times, we think, altogether too full. Think of devoting seventy

pages of the Introduction to a commentary on Amos and Hosea to a discussion of the pre-prophetic movement; its share in the revolt of Jeroboam I.; its manifestation in the time of Elijah and Elisha; the pre-prophetic societies; the older and younger Decalogues; the Book of the Covenant; the Judæan and Ephraimite narratives; the relation of pre-prophetism to Mosaism; and its essential thought. These are topics that belong in part to the History of the Religion of Israel, and in part to a commentary on the Hexateuch. True, Amos and Hosea appear, like meteors, suddenly and abruptly, and that is a phenomenon that demands explanation; but all that is needed is a few pages setting forth the essential stages in the evolution of the pre-prophetic movement prior to the time of Amos and Hosea.

It is Dr. Harper's delight to present a thorough and exhaustive discussion of every topic. And this his marvelous knowledge of all that has been written on the subject enables him to do. The first footnote on the first page of the commentary proper contains references to no less than sixteen different authors, giving name, title of book or journal, and page. This is characteristic of the work throughout. No question raised by modern criticism seems to have escaped his notice, or to have been passed by without examination. He easily threads his way through a multiplicity of opinions, testing the proofs and objections, and weighing the evidence for and against each, and as a result of such painstaking critical investigation he reaches his own conclusion which may generally be relied on as correct.

The first duty of a commentator, preliminary to his exposition of the text, is to distinguish sharply between the original parts written by the author himself, and secondary parts added by a later hand. It is becoming more and more apparent to Old Testament scholars that the prophetic books were revised time and again to bring them into closer harmony with later ideas. Unless this fact is recognized and taken into account, the history of religious thought, especially of the Messianic hope, cannot be written. Dr. Harper has devoted much study to this subject and embodied the results of his analysis of Amos and Hosea in tabular form on pages cxxxii and clx of the Introduction. He finds that about one-fifth of Amos and about one-fourth of Hosea is of later origin.

But such analysis of a book with a view to determining its original parts does not complete the preliminary task of a commentator. He must aim to recover, as far as possible, the actual words and original form, as they come from the hand of the author. The text may have become corrupt in various ways, as by omission or addition, by substitution or transposition.

Such an altered text needs to be restored, whenever possible, to its original state. This is the task of textual criticism, and it is one on which Dr. Harper has bestowed much labor. This is apparent in his textual, grammatical and philological notes. And we are glad to see that besides the ordinary means—grammar, the ancient versions, conjecture—employed for the detection and correction of a faulty text, he has made large use of the principles of metrical and strophic structure. These principles have not yet been fully settled. The study of them is but a few decades old. But they are well enough understood to show what grand possibilities for the purity of the Old Testament text lie in their judicious application.

In a short notice we of course cannot enter into details. The book throughout is scholarly, clear and complete. Its value is much enhanced by a Chronological Table of Israelitish Life and Thought, setting forth both the pre-prophetic and extra-pre-prophetic religious activity before the division of the kingdom 933 B. C., as well as the political events, the religious activity and the contemporaneous history of Syria, Moab, Assyria and Egypt from 933 to 721 B. C. There is also a map giving the geography of Amos and Hosea. Nothing has been left undone to furnish the reader with every help necessary to understand the two earliest of the Minor Prophets. This volume will take high rank in this serial commentary, and our hope and prayer is that the author may live to finish the work he has so well begun.

F. A. GAST, D.D.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT OF THE BOOK OF HOSEA. By William Rainey Harper, Professor of the Semitic Languages or Literature in the University of Chicago. Published by the University of Chicago Press, 1905. Price \$1.00.

This is a companion piece to Dr. Harper's recently published *Structure of the Text of the Book of Amos*, 1904. Taken together they give the results of his critical examination of the text of the two earliest of the Prophetic Books, and are intended to accompany his lately issued *Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, 1905, where the reasons for all changes made in the Massoretic text are fully stated.

The aim of the author in this careful critical study of the text of Hosea is to recover, as nearly as possible, the actual words of the prophet and the original form of the book ascribed to him, to the exclusion of all explanatory glosses and later editions. This implies that our transmitted Hebrew text has in the course of time undergone more or less change. What those changes are is the task Dr. Harper has here set himself to ascertain. In

this work he gives us the conclusions he has reached; but as this critical task is difficult and delicate, other scholars may, on many questions, obtain different results. It is well that each should present the facts as he sees them, leaving them to be discussed by others. Only in this way will it be possible to come in time to some general agreement.

The plan of the work is excellent. The original unprinted Hebrew text of Hosea, printed in large type, stands at the right of the left hand page; brief glosses inserted in the Massoretic text by way of explanation, and other later additions are removed to the margin at the left and printed in small type. The place of the gloss in the Massoretic text is indicated by a star (*), except (a) where the gloss is an entire clause or verse, and as such receives a verse number as in the main text, and (b) within later additions, where the glosses are enclosed in parentheses. Square brackets are employed to indicate words or phrases supposed to have been lost from the Massoretic text and here conjecturally supplied. Missing lines or portions of lines, that cannot be restored, are indicated by stars (* * * *).

The changes made in the Massoretic text are of various kinds. When a simple word requires emendation the right reading is substituted and indicated by a number referring to the lower margin, where the rejected Massoretic reading is given and the chief authorities in support of the change are cited. Thus in first case that occurs (Hos. 1: 9) the Hebrew reads, "I am not yours" (*lākem*), and the authorized version has, "I will not be your God," supplying the word "God." With most modern critics Dr. Harper changes *lākem*, "yours," to *elôhêkem*, "your God." This emendation, while it does not alter the meaning, is required by the parallelism of "my people" and "your God."

Another kind of change consists in removing to the left margin of the page later additions to the original text. Thus verses 1 and 9 of chapter I. stand apart from the rest of the chapter, as not having come from the pen of Hosea. And according to Dr. Harper about one-fourth of the Massoretic text was inserted at a later time. It is not at once apparent, however, why such late passages as 2: 6, 7, 14, 15, 8-23; 1: 10-2: 1 (Hebrew 2: 8, 9, 16, 17, 20-25, 1-3), describing Israel's return to Yahweh, are not also placed in the margin where consistency would seem to require them to stand.

Transposition of lines, verses and even long passages is not infrequent. Chapter III. immediately follows chapter 1: 9. These chapters relate the sad domestic history of Hosea, the unfaithfulness of Gomer, his wife, her purchase as a slave, and her seclusion in the prophet's home for "many days." They are

written in prose, the style of which is elevated above the ordinary when Yahweh speaks, whereas chapter II. is in poetic form, and runs parallel with chapters I. and III. Hosea sees the unfaithfulness of Israel to Yahweh, its punishment, and its ultimate penitent return to Him reflected in his painful experiences with Gomer. The prose sections are the key to the second chapter. Again chapter I: 10 and 11, II: 1 [Hebrew II: 1-3] are transferred to the close of chapter II. The justification for all these changes will be found in the commentary on *Amos* and *Hosea*.

Dr. Harper, unlike other commentators does not divide the book of Hosea into two main parts—namely chapters I.-III. and chapters IV.-XIV. He resolves it into twenty sections which are subdivided into longer or shorter strophes.

The Hebrew is closely reproduced in English on the right hand page line by line. It would be well if every commentator could publish separately his revised critical text as Dr. Harper has here done. It would be a great advantage to the scholar to have the continuous text before him instead of having it broken up throughout the commentary.

F. A. GAST, D.D.

THE DEVOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL COMMENTARY: The Epistles to the Colossians and Thessalonians. By Joseph Parker, D.D. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price \$1.25, net.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By Joseph Parker, D.D. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price \$1.25, net.

These are the first two volumes of The Practical and Devotional Commentary on the New Testament, a new work to be issued under the direction of W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D., D.D., the editor of the Expositor's Bible. Volumes III. and IV. on Peter and Mark respectively are also announced; and other volumes are in the course of preparation.

With reference to this new commentary the publishers make the following announcement: "These volumes are the first to be announced of a great new undertaking similar to the universally known Expositor's Bible. It will be under the direction of the editor of that great work, Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll, editor of the *British Weekly*, and its volumes will be the work of the foremost living theologians. Thoroughly alive to the necessity of taking advantage of every help that modern scholarship offers, this commentary will at the same time retain a healthy conservatism of judgment, and its field of usefulness will therefore be as large as its great forerunner, The Expositor's Bible."

The volumes before us, as the title implies, are practical and devotional. They make no pretense to being either critical, exegetical or expository; and they do not, therefore, appeal to persons who are looking for a commentary of that kind. But

to the preacher, who has a good critical commentary, like the *International*, and a good expository work, like the *Expositor's Bible*, and who desires to enrich his library by the addition of a work of a purely practical and devotional character, this commentary will likely prove helpful. But we would recommend, especially to young ministers, first to get the exegetical and the expository commentaries, and then, if their funds permit, to invest in this; and even then to turn to this only after a careful study of the others.

The comments, which we find here, are, as a rule, brief and to the point; and they not unfrequently illumine a passage by showing its bearing on our practical every-day life. As an example of the kind of comments, which the reader may expect, we quote the larger portion of its note on Col. 3: 1-4:

"Four times the name of Christ is repeated. The Apostle now becomes intensely spiritual, expressing his deep solicitude for the culture and strengthening of the Christian heart. It must not be overlooked that there is a sequence in the exhortation of the first verse. The two great commandments of the law are love of God and love of neighbor; so in this experience the resurrection with Christ precedes and necessitates the growth of the life in the heavenly directions. The man who has not known the power of the resurrection of Christ cannot possibly seek those things which are above. The eagle can not fly until its wings be grown; no more can the soul seek heaven until it has known what it is to share the resurrection of Christ. There is a self-disappointing aspiration. It gets no higher than the roof of the house. It can not fly away into the sanctuary and bosom of God. The reason of such disappointment is that the aspiration is only a phase of rationalism, a slavish obedience to certain literal formalities: it is not inspired by the enthusiasm of faith. A merely mechanical power knows nothing of the force of gravitation. No more does the piety of mere reason know the mystery of fellowship with God, and communion with the Holy Ghost.

"It is worse than useless to tell men to set their affections on the things above, not on the things on the earth, when they have not been away with Christ in the solitude of the tomb, and when they have not come up from that solitude clothed with the power of Christ's resurrection. Exhortation without inspiration cannot do more than disturb and vex the soul. Do not go to the seed as it lies in the seedsman's box and exhort it to bring forth leaf and flower and fruit. Until it is planted in the earth, and brought into nutritive relation to the appointed ministries of nature, it must remain without development and increase. It is precisely so with the soul of man. Man must be buried with

Christ, man must share the very tomb of Christ in its highest symbolism, and man must be consciously one with Christ in the very sufferings of the cross, or he can never set his affections on the things above."

It is after the manner in which Joseph Parker fed his great congregations; and we believe that the preacher may derive profit and stimulus from the perusal of these volumes. Only let no one deceive himself by imagining that they can take the place of the more solid critical and exegetical commentaries. Their proper use is devotional and practical; and that can be made profitable only when preceded by solid study of a different kind.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER, D.D.

THE BLUE BOOK OF MISSIONS FOR 1905. Compiled by Henry Otis Dwight, D.D., LL.L. New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls Co. Pages 242. Price \$1.00.

This book is prepared by Henry Otis Dwight, D.D., LL.D., secretary of the bureau of missions who is also one of three editors of "The New Encyclopedia of Missions," which gives the essential facts of the history of missions, the climate and physical features of the countries forming the world-wide field, of the races and tribes reached by the twentieth century missionary enterprise, etc., etc. He is, therefore, very familiar with statistics pertaining to missionary activity.

His "Blue Book of Missions for 1905" contains detailed facts and statistics regarding all missions and missionary societies, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, throughout the world.

The book is divided into three parts as follows: Part 1, subject, The Fields. In this part all missionary fields in the world are discussed from the standpoint of size, population and denominational activities of Christians, and also the activities of other religions.

Part 2, subject, The Societies. In this part the various Missionary Societies of the denominations of Christianity in all parts of the world, are concisely treated, and valuable information as to the district of their operations, addresses of their officers, and statistics of their contributions and expenditures, is given.

Part 3, subject, Miscellaneous Notes. This part contains general information of a very practical character. It furnishes the reader with the Abbreviations for Names of Missionary Societies; Chronological Tables; Missionary Conferences in Germany; Recent Books of Missionary Libraries; Missionaries and Governments; Training Schools for Missionaries; Necrology, Postage Rates from the United States to all Parts of the World; Cable Telegraph Rates; United States Values of Foreign Coins; Greek

and Jewish Church Calendar; statistics of Foreign Missionary Societies, etc.

The book is provided with a complete index. Such a blue book as this was never prepared before; and it forms a handy compendium for clergymen, missionaries, and students of missions. It tends to unify missionary efforts and broadens the aspect of Christian activity in the mind of its reader. All who possess it will realize its value, in the opportunity it affords for correct information.

W. STUART CRAMER, A.M.